LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

Rittenhouse Orrery

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

V1

D. W. Seyhard.

B. W. Sinclair.

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

T. G. APPLE, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF THE MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XV.—1868.

PHILADELPHIA:
S. R. FISHER & CO., 54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255
hep
v.15,1868
UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

INDEX.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM OF THE EARLY CHURCH.
By E. E. Higbee, D. D., Professor in Theological Seminary, Mercersburg, Pa. 5

II. THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.
By H. Harbaugh, D. D. [This Article was in type for the October number of 1867, but unavoidably crowded out, and forms one of the lamented author's unpublished Lectures delivered to the Students in the Theological Seminary, at Mercersburg, Pa.] 22

III. FORCE OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS.
By Rev. I. E. Graeff, Lancaster, Pa. . . . 33

IV. THE SECOND ADAM AND THE NEW BIRTH.
By Rev. J. W. Santee, A. M., Cavetown, Md. . . 45

V. PRESBYTERIAN UNION CONVENTION.
By Rev. John W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. . . 73

VI. CHRISTIAN NURTURE.
By the Editor. 109

VII. FORMS OF PRAYER.
By Rev. J. S. Foulk, A. M., Baltimore, Md. . . 125

VIII. AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM MEETING IN FAITH.
By Daniel Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 157

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 161

APRIL NUMBER.

I. THE LATE EDITOR.
By the Editor. 165

II. HOLY BAPTISM.
By E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 180

III. GERMANIA.
By Samuel V. Mays, Esq., A. M., Philadelphia. . . 228

IV. DIVINE REVELATION.
By E. E. Higbee, D. D., Professor in Theological Seminary, Mercersburg, Pa. 239

ARTICLE. PAGE.

V. DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 260

VI. SCHELLING'S IDEA OF ACADEMIC CULTURE
By Rev. T. Apple, A. M., Lancaster, Pa. . . 290

VII. THE VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE CHURCH.
By Daniel Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 312

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 318

JULY NUMBER.

I. DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. [Second Article.] 325

II. INSPIRATION.
By Daniel Gans, D. D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 367

III. THE MINISTER A PUBLIC MAN.
By Rev. S. N. Callender, A. M., Greencastle, Pa. . 383

IV. THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.
By the Editor. 397

V. RECENT SANITARY OPERATIONS IN EUROPE.
By Rev. L. H. Steiner, A. M., M. D., Frederick, Md. . 420

VI. CONDITION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP.
By E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 436

VII. THE FAITH OF CHRIST.
By Rev. George B. Russell, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa. . 448

VIII. ALTAR AND PRIEST.
By Rev. Walter E. Krebs, A. M., Waynesboro', Pa. . 467

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 481

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. THE STATE AS AN ELEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.
By John H. Oliver, Esq., A. M., Allentown, Pa. . . 485

II. AN INQUIRY INTO THE VALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM.
By Samuel H. Giesy, D, D., Philadelphia. . . 506

III. ANSWER TO PROFESSOR DORNER.
By J. W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 532

IV. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 646

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1868.

Art. I.—THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THEOL. SEMY. AT MERCERSBURG, PA.

To the theory of sacramental grace which is supposed to underlie the "Order of Worship" now provisionally before the German Reformed Church, some have opposed the fathers of the same Church in the sixteenth century, maintaining that their writings are in the interest of a system quite different if not directly contrary. Others, while assuming this, have gone farther, and openly proclaimed in way of challenge that such a theory finds no proper countenance from the fathers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries, and that those who pretend this only manifest the vain prattle of men too ignorant forsooth to grasp the real theological thought of the period.*

Both parties agree in finding in the baptismal formula of the "Order of Worship" the most distinct articulation of the sacramental theory or system against which they thus array both the Reformation and the primitive Church. It is involved, they assert, in the address to parents or sponsors, which is as

* "See Proceedings of the Convention of ministers and laymen held at Myerstown," pp. 19 and 22.

follows: "*You present this child here, and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the Devil, the remission of sin, and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, through the sacrament of baptism which Christ hath ordained for the communication of such great grace.*" In opposition to this, it is maintained on the one hand that children of pious parents are *not under the* power of the Devil, but are so included in the Covenant of promise as to require no deliverance of this kind. They are held to be, through their birth from Christian parents, already in the sphere of grace, and just because of this, they are to be baptized to confirm them in their already existing state of salvation. Again on the other hand and pushing the opposition still farther, it is maintained that *all* children are in some way, by the mystery of the Incarnation and without baptism or any covenant relations, in grace and beyond condemnation, at least so long as they do not by actual sins sell such heavenly inheritance. In other words, so far as the theory is intelligible, original sin is swept away by the Incarnation, and nature has thereby become so identified with grace that the birth of the flesh is no longer flesh, but spirit, until made of the flesh by some actual transgression; and baptism is administered only to guard against this terrible evil. But let us quote the very language of this opposition. "*The infant according to the Catechism,*" it is boldly asserted, "*does not belong to the Devil previous to baptism: it has a precious birth-right in the new creation, and not until by a voluntary act of its own it sells the heavenly inheritance for a mess of pottage, can it enter upon the death-road of actual sins. To guard against this terrible evil, the Catechism teaches that it must also be incorporated into the Christian Church.*"

Now it is claimed, publicly and with the assenting request of a convention of ministers and laymen met together to seek divine aid in opposing heresy, that, as against the sacramental theory of the "Order of Worship," the fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries may be regarded as in general harmony with this crude and visionary counter-theory. Indeed the advocates of the Liturgy are challenged to produce a single line

in which a theory of sacramental grace such as is involved in the baptismal formula referred to, is confirmed by their testimony. Irenæus, Cyprian, and Augustine are specially mentioned as writers who may be searched in vain for anything of the kind. We propose, therefore, in the following article, and perhaps succeeding ones, to meet this bold challenge, and bring out in a brief and general way the sacramental system in which the early Church most clearly stood.

The Apostolic Fathers, technically so called, do not develop what may be called a doctrinal system. Their entire writings, however, give utterance to the profound truth underlying all such development, *viz.*, that in Christ the source of an independent and supernatural order of life and faith has been found, in the bosom of which alone the redemption, salvation, and glorification of mankind is possible. In the communion of this life and faith, these primitive fathers continually bore witness to their consciousness of having reached the absolute religion before which all possible forms of prechristian life which confronted them must yield. They virtually stood apart from the world, feeling that in their sphere of grace they had transcended the whole compass of the world's life as this had come to manifest itself either in the forms of religion or philosophy. In them Christianity was showing itself a vast energy, flowing from the person and merit of Christ, and organizing itself as a new and practical force in history, and challenging on every hand the attention and submission of the children of men. Their mission was not to assert in distinct, scientific form the contents of their faith, but to give in the fresh vigor of practical life a powerful exhibition of that grace which, in apprehending them, had come to be felt and to be held forth as the necessary principle of all right religious activity for the world. Although not engaged in developing any definite theological system, yet they did not dream for a moment that the new order of religious life in which they stood was made theirs in the order of nature. They received it as a mystery of

grace coming from above, and only in their obedience to it did they feel that they had come to pass out of the sæculum of this world's life. Only in their full surrender thereto, and their living incorporation therein, through a regeneration supernatural in every sense, did they view themselves as called to eternal life. The Church, into which, from the world without as from the dominion of sin and Satan they had been brought by baptism, they regarded as a mystery, confronting them with the very presence of a new and heavenly order of grace in which the glorified Christ ruled and reigned. This was such a universal acknowledgment,—such a necessary postulate of faith in their age, that it is every where throughout the epistles of Ignatius assumed and made the ground of that whole system of Church unity which he seems so anxious to unfold and enforce. With him it is just the fact that Christ, the living unity of God and man, is perpetually present in the Church, which gives the possibility and renders it necessary that *it* should exhibit His fulness in a corresponding unity,—one faith, one worship, one organization, wherein the mysterious theanthropic oneness of Christ's life continually externalizes itself. "It is not possible," he says, "that the head could have been born separately without members, God having promised a union which is himself" (Epist. ad Trall. c. xi.). Again: "For this reason did the Lord receive ointment upon his head, that he might breathe into the Church incorruption." Epist. ad Ephes. c. xvii). Again: "Be ye subject to the bishop and to each other, as Jesus Christ to the Father according to the flesh, and the Apostles to Christ and to the Father and to the Spirit, that the union may be both of the flesh and of the Spirit (eternal and internal—*σαρκικη και πνευματικη*). "Epist. ad Magn. c. xiii). Dorner, after a most careful analysis of the epistles of Ignatius, says: "As we find it, his (Ignatius,) view of the person of Christ developed itself through this, that he is everywhere governed by the practical thought that the idea of the Church is, to continue Christ's person and work as his continual living image (fortgehendes lebendiges Abbild), in such way, however, that he, as the unifying principle of the divine and human, remains continually immanent in her

(als das einigende Princip des Göttlichen und Menschlichen ihr stets immanent bleibt)." (Dorner's Lehre v. d. Person Christi, vol. 1, p. 160.

It is quite needless to quote Ignatius in detail. Everywhere, page after page, Christ is viewed as the source and creative principle of a supernatural order of life whose embodiment is the Church: and all this in such real way, that, even without any direct mention of the sacraments, no one can well fail to see that these, as divine ordinances in the Church, and administered by those properly commissioned must have been regarded by him as clothed with full objective force, ever exhibiting with true effect the mediating work of the risen Lord. But Ignatius has not left us to such general inference only. He frequently refers to the sacraments, and always in the same tone of thought. "They (the heretics) hold themselves aloof from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which in goodness the Father hath raised up. (Epist. ad Smyrn. c. vii). "If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. * * * breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live in Jesus Christ forever" (ad Ephes. v. and xx.).

No mention is made, it is true, of infant baptism: but the whole theory of sacramental grace, in which infant baptism is made to have such force as is implied in the "Order of Worship," seems to be fully congenial to his thought. Dorner, without any hesitation, says, "The many passages where Ignatius speaks of the Lord's Supper (and where also he mentions baptism), show that he held this sacrament in such high regard, because in his view it is in part the means and organ of Christ whereby he communicates to the Congregation the Spirit of unity, makes his theanthropic life their life: and in part, and this almost with still more force, because he views the Eucharist as the most blooming representation of the unity and love of the congregation, as the altar upon which they, acting in the bishop and represented as unity, offer the sacrifices of their praise and thanks, and enter into a theanthropic unity with Christ and among

themselves as one body with many members by one Spirit." (Dorner, Person. Ch. vol. 1, p. 158).

While we may hold that the peculiar Church organization which Ignatius so firmly insisted upon was not as yet in all its particulars fully established throughout the Christian world, yet this only makes more evident that his view of the sacrament was of universal acceptance; for at every point, as a doctrine fully settled, he uses it to show the necessity of his Episcopal system. How unless in obedience to the bishop, can we be within the altar? At the altar is to be found the bread of God, the medicine of immortality, the centre of communion and unity, where all must come to offer their sacrifices of thanksgiving. This, which on every hand is acknowledged, necessitates, in his line of argument, that the spiritual unity of the Church in Christ which the altar communion upholds, should continually externalize itself in the bishop who by the will of Christ stands at the altar, and in whom as officiating there the whole congregation is held together as one body. Still farther, Ignatius uses his view of the sacrament against the heretics. By him already, though not so frequently nor in such definite form as by subsequent writers, the Lord's supper was held up as a witness to the truth of Christ's person and of the resurrection of the flesh; for carrying with it as universally acknowledged the true effect of Christ's body and blood, it necessarily arrayed the whole Church against all Gnostic or Doketic views of his person. How, when the Church with one accord holds that the passion and consequent glorification of Christ are sacramentally made of real effect in the Lord's Supper, can any one dare to assert that he only suffered in appearance? How again, if our flesh and blood are in the sacrament fed and nourished by a flesh and blood in which are lodged the power of an endless life, can any one dare to assert that there can be no resurrection of the body? Already, we say, in Ignatius this method of argument is manifesting itself: and it is perfectly puerile to imagine that he stands in no general fellowship with that theory of sacramental grace which underlies the "Order of Worship;" and it is only by a

complete subversion of his real position that he can be brought into any sympathy with modern puritanism.

In Justin Martyr there is a somewhat more developed plan of thought: He is not engaged in giving form to or defending the unity of the Church in its organization. In his day this had ceased to be of so much practical force. But Christianity had already made such rapid inroads upon heathenism in the Roman Empire, that the old order of religious life and culture had become aroused, as in self-defence, to the most determined opposition. This opposition was not only that of the state in way of its penalties and persecutions, developing from the side of Christianity the patience and fortitude of a noble army of martyrs: but there was also at the same time an attack from the whole literary and philosophical culture of heathenism, both boldly from without and covertly from within in forms of heresy, which necessitated a corresponding defence upon the part of the Church. To this labor of patience and defence, requiring fortitude of will and in some measure a philosophical spirit, Justin addressed himself, and deservedly earned the double title of martyr and philosopher. From the necessity thus imposed (as well as from an inward impulse) of asserting the divine philosophy of Christianity,—of showing how it involves the highest reason, and indeed reason in its totality (*λογικὸν τὸ ὅλον*), we find in Justin the germs of a profound Christological system beginning to manifest themselves.

Our object is not to attempt to determine the characteristics of such a system in this its incipiency, but rather to show how Justin, while maintaining the absolute revelation of the incarnate Logos, held that He, the world's Saviour, applied to men the redeeming power of his own endless life. Justin, like Ignatius, finds the perennial source of all salvation in Christ, but enters upon a more lengthy discussion of the objective means of its appropriation. In a general way, he thus gives expression to his view in reference to both these points. "Christ, being the first-born of the whole creation, has become also the beginning (*ἀρχὴ*) of a new race regenerated by him through water,

and faith, and the wood which holds the mystery of the cross." (Dial. with Tryph. c. 138).

Most clearly the new race here referred to is not the entire human family, carried beyond and out of the whole scope of original sin by the Incarnation, viewed as some magical potence now universally operative in the law of physical genesis so that by original birth each and all have at the start a heavenly birthright or inheritance. On the contrary, in most plain terms the new race is one that is made such *by a regeneration through water and faith.* Justin makes a broad distinction between the carnal and spiritual birth. The infant born of earthly parents in some way has his starting point in sin and bondage and is without a spiritual birth. When attempting to explain this, he refers to the transgression of Eve and the sensuality of the flesh, but never loses sight of the reality of a world of demons and the usurped dominion of Satan. "Eve who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death"—" * * * the beast (serpent) through which transgression and disobedience had their origin" (Dial. with Tryph. c. 100 and 112). Over against this birth in the sphere of death and under the dominion of Satan, Justin ever places the mystery of another and spiritual birth in the order of grace. This spiritual birth, this supernatural regeneration, he holds, has its beginning point in the sacrament of baptism. In his Apology, c. 61, he writes: "We will state how we consecrate ourselves to God being renewed by Christ" * * * * after proper preparation upon the part of the candidates, "we lead them to a place where there is water and there they are regenerated in the same manner as we also were; for they are washed in that water in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

There is no direct reference here or in any of Justin's writings to infant baptism: but there is such an acknowledgment of the objective force of the sacrament and also of the purpose of its institution, as must set aside every thought that the new

creation in Christ becomes ours by birthright while in the order of nature, which birthright we lose or sell when coming to what may be called actual transgression. Not the least shadow of such a theory crosses the pathway of his thought. On the contrary, a view of sacramental grace, similar in its general features to that underlying the "Order of Worship," seems perfectly familiar to his mind; and it is easy to see how, with such a view, any opposition to infant baptism which might arise could not long maintain itself in the early Church.

In reference to the Lord's Supper, Justin unequivocally states, that in the distribution of the elements we are nourished with the true body and blood of Christ. There has been much discussion in regard to the mode after which he supposes the body and blood of Christ to be present in the Sacrament, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed alike claiming him in their favor. The language of Justin is certainly ambiguous in this respect; but no one has ever thought of denying the truth that he views the Eucharist as exhibiting to us with true effect the body and blood of Christ, however much difference may have arisen in reference to his alleged explanation of the mystery. The passage, whose interpretation has been the subject of so much discussion, is this. "We do not receive these as common (*κοινὸν*) bread nor as common drink, but even as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, who was incarnate by the word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also have we been taught that the food, which has been offered in thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν*) by the prayer of the word which is from him, and by which our flesh and blood are nourished by a transmutation (*κατὰ μεταβολήν*), is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." (Apology, c. 66). However the *κατὰ μεταβολήν* of this passage may be explained, there can be no question but that the whole course of thought clearly indicates that Justin regards the participants of the Supper as truly receiving therein the heavenly nourishment of the body and blood of Christ.

Justin also refers to a sacrificial element in the Supper, and has been claimed by Mœhler and Dœllinger and others as favoring the Roman Catholic dogma of the mass. In his dialogue

with Trypho, chap. 117, he says, "Accordingly, God, anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through His name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer, that is in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well pleasing to Him." Again chap. 41, "And the offering of flour which was commanded to be presented for those who were cleansed of leprosy was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ, our Lord, commanded to be observed in remembrance of the passion which He endured for those who are cleansed in their souls, from all wickedness. * * * He (Malachi) then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, *i. e.* the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist."

Now while in the passage before cited the bread and wine are regarded as sacramental means through which our human life is divinely nourished with the body and blood of Christ, they are here at the same time viewed as the means through which we bring sacrificially to our remembrance the passion of Christ, and join our offerings with that great offering made once for all.

Semisch, following Hofling, holds that Justin regards the sacrifice as one of thanks. But certainly it is not the ordinary thankfulness which is awakened by bringing to the mind in way of thought only the narrative or scene of the Saviour's death. It is a special thanksgiving, a Eucharistic offering, offered in the compass and under the mystery of a peculiar sacramental remembrance of Christ's death, a remembrance through the breaking of bread and the pouring out of wine, and inseparably connected thus with a peculiar solemn altar communion of Christ's body and blood. Justin could hardly base his argument for the truth of Christianity upon the fact that the bread and wine of the Eucharist fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi, that in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure offering, unless the sacrificial offerings of Christians had for special reasons been regarded as concentering themselves in the Eucharist. But why this convergence to that one mystery? Just because *there* was the sacramental memorial of that one great

offering which had been made upon the Cross in union with which alone all the offerings of the faithful become acceptable. Just because the bread when used in the Sacrament was to be no common bread, and the wine no common wine, but to exhibit in mystery the reality of Christ's body and blood as sacrificed for us, were they regarded as offerings placed upon the altar, wherein through the whole transaction, the faithful were showing forth in mystery the Lord's death until He comes. Such at least seems to be the underlying faith of Justin, and while it is by no means such as involves the doctrine of the mass, it is in its general features in harmony with the theory underlying the "Order of Worship." In no conceivable way can Justin's view of the Sacrament be twisted into conformity with the puritanic type of thought.

Semisch, to whom we have referred, and whose testimony is of great weight in a question of this kind, has taken occasion to remark in his able work on the life, writings, and opinions of Justin Martyr, that, "at first the Church was united on the question, by what instrumentality individuals obtained a participation in the redemption accomplished by Christ. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were unanimously considered as the two objective vehicles (?) by which the gifts of Christian grace passed into the hearts and lives of Christians" (see Translation by Ryland, vol. 2, p. 239).

In Irenæus, we have the great Church teacher of the close of the second century, who, familiar with the various tendencies of theological thought in both East and West, endeavors with great vigor of practical life and with a profound depth of scientific investigation to bring these tendencies into some organic unity, and to harmonize them by establishing a broad Christological base in which they may find their proper measure of meaning and truth. With a strange ignorance of his entire order of thought, this great teacher has been specially pointed out as one who cannot be shown to be in harmony with that sacramental theory, which, underlying the "Order of Worship," makes such earnest account of the broad distinction between the spheres of nature and grace as to necessitate a new birth from

above before in any sense our human life can be said to be delivered from the power of the Devil, and pass out of the condemnation of death.

Most assuredly does Irenæus, as is claimed by those who seek his authority for a visionary theory which he never held, "assert that the Logos entered the womb of the Virgin, not arbitrarily, but for a profound reason," and thereby came from thence onward to cover the whole compass of our earthly life from conception through growth and death and Hades, and upward to its height of exaltation at the right hand of the Father. But how does this gloriously accomplished redemption of humanity, as in the person of Christ, reach men and deliver them from the power of the Devil, and from the dominion of death and hell, cancelling the sin of their old conception, and the iniquity of their original birth? Does Irenæus leave us in a moment's doubt as to what answer he gives to this, the very question at issue? Does he hold the crude theory that all are born now naturally into the bosom of grace wrought out by Christ, and that the old Adamic life is now set aside, and that the new, as a natural inheritance, must be guarded from being sold by actual sins, through the sacrament of baptism? The very passage which seems to be in the mind of the writer who claims it as testimony in his own favor, is directly at variance with any such thought. "He comes to save all through himself: all I say, who through Him are regenerated into God, (omnes, inquam, qui renascuntur in Deum), infants, children, &c." (Adv., hær., 11, 22.) It is by a regeneration therefore that the salvation is made effective for any; and this regeneration is held by him to be effected by baptism. Indeed in the very next book baptism is defined by him as "regeneratio in Deum." Dr. Schaff has well remarked in his History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, pp. 402, 403, that "the profound view of Irenæus involves an acknowledgment not only, as is universally granted, of the idea of infant baptism, but also of the practice of it: for in the mind of the ancient Church, baptism and regeneration were intimately connected, and by Irenæus they are distinctly identified."

No less explicit, so far as the general idea of sacramental grace is concerned, is the view which Irenæus takes of the Lord's Supper. His profound thought that Christ in his humanity, having passed through the various stages of human life, perfecting each, and having become glorified, is now and by virtue of all this the fountain of the Holy Ghost,—the living principle of a new creation for all who believe,—this his profound thought must of necessity enter into his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as indeed it conditions his whole conception of the Church, as carrying in itself the presence and fulness of Christ's glorified life, through the Holy Ghost. In Christ, according to Irenæus, the divine idea of man has reached a full realization, and this in such way that He is through the Holy Ghost the source and substance now of all such realization for the children of men. Christ is the spiritual man,—the concrete exhibition of the divine idea of human life, and thus while at the same time he is the fullest, the perfect revelation of the divine, he is also the Son of man, in whom the highest self-communication of God to the creature is reached, in whom the very fulness of the Spirit dwells to be poured out thence as the quickening power, the sanctifier of the children of men. According to Irenæus, the incarnation of the Logos viewed as the very summit of divine revelation, reaches out of necessity to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, through which mystery Christ in his own body the Church is uniting with himself by living incorporation those who thus come to share in his life and are enabled to secure their proper perfection in the resurrection of the body and full glorification; for, in his view, the idea of human life could not find its realization in Christ's perfection of it in his own person, except as through this also by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost the human race should be made to partake of its fulness—(See the valuable analysis of Duncker, "Des hiel Irenæus Christol." pp. 260–262). From this how evident it must be that in his view no process of life in which men are to realize the divine aim of their being can be conceived as possible except it have its source in Christ,—except it be in the compass of his spiritual activity. Such process of life *must* have its beginning in *regeneration;*

but this regeneration, as we have seen from the statement of Irenæus, has its starting point in the sacrament of baptism. Now, and this is the point we have in view, it is evident from his whole line of thought, that this new life must be kept in being, continued in its process onward to resurrection and glorification by a nourishment reaching it from the same central source, the glorified human through the Holy Ghost. The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ must, in consistency with the profound thought of Irenæus, be viewed as carrying with it the reality of a heavenly food in the eating whereof resurrection and everlasting life are possible.

But we are not left to infer this simply from his general order of thought. He has himself given explicit utterance to such a view when mentioning the Lord's Supper. "How say they, that the flesh passeth to corruption and partaketh not of life, which is itself nourished from the body of the Lord and his blood? Either let them change their mind, or abstain from offering the things above spoken of. But our meaning is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist again confirms our meaning. * * * For as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer perishable having the hope of the resurrection to life everlasting." (Adver. hær. iv. 18, 5.) Here Irenæus boldly meets a heretical denial of the resurrection of the body by citing a universally acknowledged doctrine of the Church, *viz.*, that in the Eucharist as nourishing food, the body and blood of Christ come to be the very warrant that our body and blood shall reach an imperishable life. So again, and for the same purpose, he writes: "Since we are his members and are nourished through the creature, and he himself gives us the creature, making his sun to rise and raining, as he willeth, he owned the cup which is from the creature, to be his own blood from which he bedeweth our blood, and the bread from the creature he affirmed to be his own body, from which he increaseth our bodies. When then both the mingled cup and the created bread receive the word of God, and

the Eucharist becometh the body and blood of Christ, and from these the substance of our flesh is increased and consisteth, how do they say that the flesh is not capable of receiving the gift of God which is eternal life—the flesh, which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, and is his member as the blessed Paul saith, that we are all members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Adver. hær. v. 2, 2 and 3).

Who can question for a moment but that Irenæus here maintains that the consecrated elements in some way exhibit with true effect the body and blood of Christ, so that in participating the faithful are kept and preserved in body, soul and spirit unto everlasting life? The objective force of the sacrament is most unreservedly held up to view, and in such a way as at once to shock the moral sensibilities of a large portion of puritanism. It is true that in the passages thus far quoted no specific reference has been made to the activity of the Holy Spirit; and Semisch has some ground apparently for his position that "the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was too undeveloped at this time to suppose that Irenæus conceived him to be the mediating principle between the outward elements in the Lord's Supper and Christ." But in the fragments edited by Pfaff (which Semisch from his position feels compelled to regard spurious), the activity of the Holy Spirit is most plainly indicated and in full harmony also with the train of thought which characterizes the other writings of Irenæus. "We offer," one of these fragments runs, "unto God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto him, that he has commanded the earth to send forth these fruits for our nourishment, and afterwards, having duly performed the oblation, *we call forth the Holy Spirit that he would make this sacrifice and this bread the body of Christ*, that they who receive these antitypes may obtain forgiveness of sins and eternal life" (Pfaff fragm. Anecd. S. Iren. pp. 26, 27, as quoted by Dr. Pusey). Dorner while opposing the position of Semisch just refered to, gives a summary of what he regards the doctrine of Irenæus. It may be found in a note on page 495 of the first volume of his "Lehre v. d. Person Christi." "The outward elements, neither changed into Christ's body and

blood, nor merely signifying them, nor again merely carrying in themselves the incarnate Logos, are rather, by means of the operation of the Holy Ghost on the one hand, and of Christ on the other, who assumes them, raised up to be momenta of his humanity and so through sacramental union therewith belong to the body and blood of Christ, who in them or through his sacramental connection with them continually restores for himself the momentum (otherwise withdrawn until his coming again) of his objective reality, presence and visibility (der in ihnen, oder durch seine sacramentliche Verbindung mit ihnen, das bis zur Wiederkunft Christi zurueckgetretne Moment der objectionen Wirklichkeit, Gegenwart und Sichtbarkeit, sich fort wieder herstellt), in such way of course as to be perceptible only to faith, as indeed the word of God and also Christ himself in his outward historical manifestation could be apprehended in their real character only by faith."

It has not been our object, however, to ascertain whether Irenæus leans more to the Lutheran, than to the Reformed doctrine of the Supper, but only to show with what unhesitating boldness he recognizes the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the mystery of the sacrament to nourish the faithful who participate thereof unto everlasting life, and that, in maintaining this reality of sacramental grace, he is in full harmony with the general church theory underlying the "Order of Worship." Who can doubt this for a single moment? Where is there the least syllable which may be said to be in opposition?

Here then we have the clear testimony of the second century, from those writers most thoroughly acquainted with the life of the Church, and most profoundly interested in her defence and progress,—a testimony upholding with full accord and with unhesitating conviction that idea of sacramental grace for the acknowledgment of which the "Order of Worship" of the German Reformed Church is now sought to be convicted of heresy. From the feet of the Apostles, these martyrs of the second century, part of that noble army which praises God, seem to know no other theory. Indeed it is so universally recognized, so uniformly assumed as fundamental to the very idea of the Church

and Christianity, that their writings fail to be intelligible in the atmosphere or light of any other system. This of itself should be enough to challenge the prayerful consideration of those who find their whole order of thought and faith in the element of another and contrary system. If puritanism is unwilling to open its eyes to such a historical reality, waving away as of but little account to itself the faith of the second century in this respect, it may expect the same irreverence to be paid to its own tradition and history. With assurance *it* appeals to the canon of Scripture, but with equal assurance also did the martyrs of the second century appeal to the Apostles whose very voice was still echoing in their ears. The force of such early historical testimony may be thought to be set aside with the pat theory that already the whole church was hastening into the apostasy of Roman Catholicism, and that this whole sacramental theory is itself the clear evidence of the testimony of such a complete revolution. But why perchance may not the force of puritan tradition be thought to be set aside by the theory that *it* is hastening into the apostasy of rationalism, in which the whole mystery of the supernatural is no longer a reality for faith? Why must puritanism of the nineteenth century be more secure from departure from Apostolic tradition, than the whole Church of the second century in which were many who saw the forms and heard the burning eloquence of the Apostles themselves, and with which the fresh fragrance of St. John's old age still lingered like the breath of love?

ART. II.—THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

The sense of sin is universal. Not only are all men sinners, but all men feel that they are. From the broad, burdened bosom of heathenism arises a deep groan of misery from a sense of sin. Paganism, too, has sought after forgiveness of which it has a shadowy knowledge, and a vague belief. Hence it has its priests, altars, sacrifices, confessions, penances, ablutions, and prayers.

Among the unforgiven in Christian lands the same feeling exists. They may not clearly apprehend it—it may be only the cold, dreary absence of a peaceful sense—it may be the negative satisfaction of those who know of nothing better—even as one whose eyes have always been dim knows of nothing more lovely than that which he sees. As a stupid sinner, he may bear his burden, as a beast does his, regarding it as his fate, or as belonging to his nature. As one who somewhat reflects, he may attribute the shadows of his spirit to another source. As a deceived and blinded sinner, he may ease his spirit by strong delusions, imagining himself to be at rest and happy, even as a madman fancies himself a king, and a drunken man believes himself rich.

Wherever the sense of sin exists, there is also the foreshadowing of the doctrine of forgiveness, even where its blessedness is not enjoyed. What the sin-burdened heart needs, and thus unconsciously longs for, is graciously and clearly proclaimed by the Church: "That God, for the sake of Christ's satisfaction, will no more remember my sins, neither the sinful nature with which I have to struggle all my life long; but graciously imparts to me the righteousness of Christ, that I may never more come into condemnation."

The first thing to be known and kept in mind in regard to

the forgiveness of sins, is that it is a mercy in the Church, and not in the world—a truth known to faith, not to nature; and that it is to be understood and received in the Church, and by those who are in her bosom.

This is indicated by its location in the Creed. It follows the article of the Church, and does not precede it. As in the Creed, so in our faith, we come first to the Church, then into the communion of saints, and so to the forgiveness of sins.

On this point, Olevianus speaks as follows:

"How dost thou understand the possession of the benefits of Christ in this life? I understand it thus: In like manner as there is no salvation to such as are out of the Church, which is the body of Christ, so also all those who are true and living members in the Church have now, and possess true salvation, which salvation we comprehend entire in the forgiveness of sins, as the Apostle Paul, Rom. iv. 7, 8, shows from Psalm xxxii. 1, 2, 'Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.'"*

The sentiment is common—but as it is common so is it false—that the forgiveness of sin is to be obtained outside of and separate from the Church, and without its intervention—and that this boon is to be enjoyed before the Church is entered. Where this idea is held, it is supposed that the forgiveness of sin is a gift from the Holy Ghost direct, and without the medium of the Church. In that case, the Creed ought to run: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the forgiveness of sin." But it does not so run. Nor does it reach the forgiveness of sin, except passing through the intervening articles of the Holy Catholic Church, and the communion of saints.

The Holy Scripture plainly follows the same order; teaching that the remission of sin is to be obtained through the Church, by the intervention of its ministers and sacraments.

Our Saviour remitted sin directly, by a word, without any ministerial or sacramental intervention, because in Him dwelt

---

* Olevianus' Fester Grund Christlicher Lehre, p. 161.

the absolute and underived power to pardon. Matt. ix. 6. Mark ii. 10. Luke v. 24. He had power on earth to forgive sin. When He left the earth, He made provision for the continued exercise and application of that power on earth—not independent of Him, but from Him. Not at any one's caprice, but by an order of His own institution.

Hence we find that our Saviour, after His resurrection, met His disciples and said to them: "Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." St. John xx. 21–23.

How were they to remit, or retain sin? Not by words spoken, but by acts done. By receiving the penitent into the Church. This is plain from the passages parallel to the one quoted; where we find that our Saviour gives the binding and loosing, the remitting and retaining power to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and afterwards to all the disciples (Matt. xviii. 18), defining the way in which it is to be done: namely, "By the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." By the keys, as a figurative expression, our Saviour teaches His disciples, and through them His ministers, that as one man who has a right to the house, opens the door for another and admits him, so they, having a right to do so because He now appoints them, shall open the Kingdom of Heaven, or the Church, to seeking penitents, admitting them into it, and thus to the remission of sin.

If it be asked what the door is, that admits into the Church, and to the remission of sins, no one can be at a loss for the true answer. "We confess one Baptism for the remission of sins." The very act itself shows it to be a washing, cleansing—a putting away of defilement, and a putting on of Christ. (Gal. iii. 27). "Why tarriest thou?" said Ananias to Paul, "arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts xxii. 16. "Repent," said Peter to the penitents on Pentecost, "and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts ii. 38. Rom. vi. Eph. v. 26.

Thus only through baptism, as an effect or result of it, are sins remitted. Thus only by entering the Church, and being in the communion of saints do we escape from the curse, and come to the "forgiveness of sins."

We must, however, not deceive ourselves with the idea that by a mere outward submission to baptism, are our sins remitted. Baptism itself must be rightly received. He that would receive the forgiveness of sin in baptism—where alone it is to be found—must not fail to connect with it what Christ has connected with it.

The following conditions must be fulfilled; and if fulfilled, full remission is given in baptism:

1. *Repentance.* This, in the case of adults, is connected with baptism and remission of sin, and must precede both. Luke xxiv. 47. Acts ii. 38. Acts v. 31.

A distinction must be made between the cause and the condition of the remission of sins. The cause is in what God has done, the condition is in what man does, moved thereto by "God's grace. The Reformed Church says with Calvin, that repentance is not the cause of remission of sins."*

2. *Confession.* "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John i. 9.

3. *Faith.* "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." Mark xvi. 16. Col. ii. 12.

4. *Purpose to leave sin.* Jesus said unto her, "Go, sin no more." John viii. 11. To the one who had had an infirmity thirty-eight years, and whom He had healed, He said, "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee." John v. 14. When Simon desired baptism, not as a means of getting free of his evil ways, but only as a power to continue the more successfully in them, it did not

* Inst. Book III., chap. iv. § 3.

benefit him, but left him as it found him, in the "gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity." Acts viii. Is. lv. 7.

The want of these hinder remission of sins by baptism, even as the want of sunshine, rain, and a proper soil hinder the life and growth of the planted seed; and when all these are present, baptism remits sin, or Christ, through this sacrament, as surely as the seed grows when all the conditions of growth are at hand.

In baptism, then, God signs and seals to such as receive it in penitence and faith the remission of their past sins. Their hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with pure water. Heb. x. 22. In baptism, the apostle teaches, the old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed. Rom. vi. It is a burial with Christ into death; so that a rising with Him to a new life may then begin.

But this newness of life in which we are to walk from baptism (Rom. vi. 4), like all life, is not at once complete, but has its period of infantile feebleness, and is exposed to the infirmities and failings which intervene between "the babe" and the "full age" of a strong man in Christ. (Heb. v. 12–14). Though life reigns germ-like in the new, inward, spiritual man, yet, as the Canaanites, the old inhabitants of the land, and the old enemies of Israel still lingered to vex and war, and even to gain temporary, local victories, and were only at length fully subdued and cast out, so in the outward, old, natural man sin lingers and works, and wars against the new life which is casting it out more and more. The infirmities of nature which remain, the flesh from within, the world from without, and Satan from beneath, trammel and trip, and seduce the spirit into occasional sin. Hence we are still to pray, as in the Lord's prayer: "Forgive us our debts."

Thus, then, though in baptism past sin is remitted, there must be provision in the Church for the remission of after sins, and for assuring us that they are remitted that we may enjoy the necessary comfort and peace. This Christ has done in

leaving with His Church the power of the keys, not only to admit the penitent by baptism, but to restore him to pardon and peace when, through temptation, he has fallen from his baptism into sin. It is in immediate connection with the restoration of a fallen brother, that our Saviour assures His apostles, that they are invested with the power of binding and loosing. Matt. xviii. 15–22. He moreover tells them, that "until seventy times seven" times shall remission be granted him on repentance, and what they shall "loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Of this the penitent offender is sweetly assured in their act of pardon.

This power of absolution is always at hand to be exercised. If the Roman Church abused it, the Reformed Church did not therefore cast it away. At certain times, "according to the command of Christ, it is proclaimed and openly witnessed to believers, one and all, that so often as they accept with true faith the promise of the Gospel, all their sins are really forgiven them of God, for the sake of Christ's merits."*

Every time a true believer, penitent in view of his past sins, receives the holy supper of the Lord, the Church, through Christ's ministry, by His appointment and authority in that sacrament, most sweetly assures him, that he is "a partaker of the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and all His benefits."† One of these benefits is the remission of sins. Matt. xxvi. 28. "Paul directs that by the use of the Holy Supper we shall show forth the Lord's death till He come. 1 Cor. xi. 26. This wonder of all wonders, that God himself suffers death, to confirm His promises concerning the forgiveness of sins, must be proclaimed, believed, and highly praised. This is truly an assurance above all assurance, a faithfulness above all faithfulness."‡ To receive the Lord's Supper aright, is "to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the forgiveness of sins and eternal life."§

---

* Quest. 84

† Heid. Cat., quest. 75.

‡ Olevianus' Fester Grund, p. 164.

§ Idem., quest. 76.

For "the Lord's Supper testifies to us, that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which He Himself has once accomplished on the cross."*

This view of the forgiveness of sins, is the only one familiar to the early Reformed theologians. They knew nothing of that conception of this doctrine which makes it a human act, and places the assurance of it in the subjective fancy or feeling alone. In their system of the order of grace, the forgiveness of sins stands just where it does in the order of the Creed—that is, they make it a grace in the Church through sacramental ministries.

Thus Calvin, speaking of the Church, says: "It is also to be remarked, that out of her bosom there can be no hope of remission of sins, or any salvation."†

Calvin teaches that baptism is the sacrament of initiation into the Church, and so also of the remission of sin. "For He commands all who believe to be baptized for the remission of sins. Therefore those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign, by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' In this sense we are to understand what is said by Paul, that 'Christ sanctifies and cleanses the Church with the washing of water by blood;' and in another place, that 'according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;' and by Peter, that 'Baptism doth save us.' For it was not the intention of Paul to signify, that our ablution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains in itself the virtue to purify, regenerate and renew; nor did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that the knowledge and assurance of it is received in this sacrament."‡

---

* Heid. Cat., quest. 80.

† Inst. Book IV., chap. i. 4.

‡ Inst. Book IV., chap. xv. 1, 2.

On the same ground, Calvin also sets forth the perennial or future force and virtue of baptism as the only basis and warrant of perpetual remission of sin in the Church. Thus he says: "Nor must it be supposed, that Baptism is administered only for the time past, so that for sins, into which we fall after baptism, it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism, were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened, in former ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of their death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life—a preposterous caution, which is frequently censured in the writings of the ancient bishops. But we ought to conclude, that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins."

Calvin further insists, that absolution by the power of the keys, is itself indissolubly connected with baptism, and is in fact the means of its perpetual force or virtue. "I know the common opinion is, that remission of sins, which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone, is afterwards obtained by repentance and the benefit of the keys. But the advocates of this opinion have fallen into an error, for want of considering that the power of the keys, of which they speak, is so dependent on baptism, that it cannot by any means be separated from it. It is true, that the sinner receives remission by the ministry of the Church; but not without the preaching of the Gospel. Now, what is the nature of that preaching? That we are cleansed from our sins by the blood of Christ. What sign and testimony of that absolution is there, except baptism? We see, then how this absolution is referred to baptism."*

To the same effect are the words of Ursinus, setting forth

* Inst. Book IV., chap. xv. 4.

"*Certaine Conclusions of Baptisme.*" He says: "And as the Covenant once made with God, is also afterwards, after sins committed, perpetually firme and of force to the repentant, so also Baptisme being once received, confirmeth and assureth the repentant all their lifetime, of remission of sinnes; and therefore neither ought it to be re-iterated, neither to bee deferred untill the end of our life; as if it so only cleansed men from sinnes, if no sinnes be committed after it is once received."*

It may be said, and often is said that our forgiveness takes place in the divine mind, and that all we have to do is to seek it by prayer. Both these are true. But the question still comes up, How shall we be *assured* that we are pardoned? Do we say by the Spirit? We answer, yes. But we must also be assured, that what we feel as a sense of pardon, is by the Spirit, and not a feeling or a fancy only. The spirits themselves must be tried whether they be of God. (1 John iv. 1). The Spirit does not operate outside of the Church and independent of it, but in it, and through its word, sacraments and ordinances. These are Christ's institutions, which the Spirit does not set aside, but carry out; in them and by them the Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. John xvi. Thus, when we come as penitents, Christ in His Church, by His ministers, not only authoritatively and by a true and real commission, pronounces to us the words or promises of pardon, but signs and seals them by sacraments, as by divine acts, upon which the heart believes, is assured of pardon in a tangible way, and by a peace which passes all understanding, "the Spirit itself bears witness with"—not *to*—"our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii. 16). Thus the Spirit guides us into truth, not by speaking "of Himself," but by taking of Christ's and showing it unto us. (John xvi. 13–15). It is by the ordinances of Christ, in His Church, that the Spirit verifies to us His own work.

All our acts must be endorsed and met by divine acts. Penitence, prayer, confession, faith, and all experiences under the

---

* Dr. Parry's old English translation of Pareus' Ursinus, pp. 425, 426.

operations of grace are our acts; and these can nevermore verify themselves, but must be verified by divine acts. These divine acts are God's sacraments. They are not what we do to Him, but what God does to us. In baptism we are subjects, not actors—recipients, not factors—be baptized of God, not baptize thyself to Him. "Take eat"—not take give. In these divine acts, by the Church as commissioned for that purpose, all that we do is made valid and acknowledged before we can be assured that it is valid for us. Just as any legal paper, deed, must be signed and acknowledged by the State, though rightly drawn, before it is valid.

Without such an act in which our pardon is certified to us, our hearts cannot possess a full and satisfying sense of forgiveness. When a child has offended and grieved its parent, and goes about with penitent and sorrowing heart, the parent may have pardoned it in his own heart, and the child may fancy that it is pardoned; but it cannot be unerringly and comfortably assured of it except by the words and acts of the parent. The words must be heard, the smile, and the approach, as the act of reconciliation, must be seen, before the repenting heart can feel assured that its repentance is accepted by the parent, and the pardon actually given.

A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received baptism as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission; and when, after baptism, he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed and sealed by Christ, by means of a divine act through the Church. This truth is beautifully set forth in the parable of the Prodigal Son. He was penitent; and as a penitent returned. He confessed: "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." His father even gave him a strong token of welcome: "He had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." Yet was the prodigal's heart full of fear and doubt. He repeated, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more

worthy to be called thy son." But now the father does that to him, which God does to the penitent sinner in the Church, gives him, through his servants, sacramental signs and seals of acceptance and pardon. "The father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet; and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry. For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry." Luke xv. 11–32.

Here comes a poor penitent who has been far away, and spent all in the world of sin. He thinks, in his misery, of the Church, in which his father dwells. He comes back, but full of fear. "Guilt holds him back and fear alarms." The father sees him, advances toward him with promises and show of mercy. But still the sinner trembles, and fears the wrath which his sins have most justly provoked. He cannot believe and confide, even though he sees smiles where he expected to see frowns; he stands still, even though he sees outstretched arms where he expected to see uplifted hands of warning and wrath. He answers every invitation and promise with the words: "Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and in Thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son." But he hears the Father speak to his servants: Take the poor polluted, but penitent wanderer in sin, wash him in the water of baptism, and thus put My name on him, and bring him into My house. Give him a place among My saints. Make room for him at My table, and let him eat of the body of My beloved Son, and tell him it was broken for him; give him of the cup, and tell him it is the New Testament in His blood, which was shed for him for the remission of sins. Say this to him, as from Me. Thy sins, which were many, are all forgiven thee! Then there is joy in the house. Then there is joy among the angels. Then there is joy in the penitent's own heart. He hears the Father now say: "My son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." He doubts no more, but in the full assurance of hope, begins: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins."

Art. III.—FORCE OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF, OF LANCASTER, PA.

There was a time when religious ideas and institutions were held up as the creation of designing men, who imposed them upon a credulous populace for the gratification of their own selfish purposes. It was taken for granted, that man was not constitutionally religious, but that, if he were left to himself, the development of his manhood would be normal and free from all the degrading influences of religious superstition. These views were boldly proclaimed by the vulgar infidelity of the last century; and the promulgators and defenders of them prided themselves as being particularly enlightened, as having discovered the true philosophy of human nature, and as being the apostles of a new era of emancipation. Never was there a more blind, a more arbitrary, and a more unphilosophical school in all history. It did not understand the mental and moral organism of man, nor did it derive any benefit from the universal experience of the race. Hence the explosion of its absurd dogmas, and the lowering of its flaunting banner to the dust.

The infidelity of our own day is of a somewhat different order. It has taken down the old banner and flung a new one to the breeze, and, instead of blasphemous frothing about priestcraft and popular credulity, we have now the bewitching song of sentimental piety. Religion is no longer treated as an imposture or a lie, but it is reduced to the level of a mere humanitarian scheme, for the accomplishment of secular or mundane ends simply. So then we have this modern infidel wolf in the garb of a lamb, wearing a sanctimonious air and mouthing religion to the world, but denying the divine supernatural character of that religion, which alone can demand faith and submission, on the part of the world, on truly historical and philosophical

grounds. That religious ideas are a normal, necessary, and ennobling part of our being all the world is now forced to acknowledge, and hence the change of base in the infidel camps. The tone of modern scepticism differs from that of a century ago as differeth the hoarse braying of an ass from the soft cooing of a dove. But this change of tactics will not help the case in the end, for it leaves the world still without a central power to moralize and civilize the nations, by placing man into a normal relationship to the author of his being. Christianity, in its proper mystical and sacramental character, has proven itself to be a world-historic fact, which readily meets and satisfies all the legitimate demands of our nature, and whatever sets itself up against its claims is the enemy, not only of religion and the kingdom of heaven as such, but of human progress and elevation. Let the voice of history tell the destiny that is likely to come upon all the lying spirits, that preach another gospel than that of Jesus Christ.

Christianity differs from all other systems, not in degree simply, but in kind. The mythologies of the pagan world were not wholly false and corrupt. They maintained the principles of morality in some degree, and, in the days of their primitive power, they wielded an influence which was largely instrumental in promoting good order and prosperity in society. But they were constructed by men, who knew not the truth beyond the power of their natural ken, and who, though great and wise, did not possess the true knowledge of either God or man. The gigantic efforts of Greek and Roman statesmen and philosophers to organize society properly and to place its manners on a firm and solid foundation are worthy of profound respect, but many of their dogmas were revolting and can only be excused on the ground of ignorance. In course of time these mythological absurdities became apparent and religious ideas began to grow weak in consequence, and then society entered upon a course of corruption, that brought the race to the very verge of despair and threatened to end in the complete dissolution of all moral and social ties. Such a crisis the race had reached, when Jesus Christ first proclaimed Himself Messiah, and took the reins of

the moral universe into His own divine-human hands. When that glorious era of the gospel commenced, the convictions of men were made to rest on the world historic facts of the life of Christ, and public conscience was placed under the beneficent sway of Christian faith and charity.

Jesus addressed Himself to the people. His gospel is a mystery, but not that sort of a mystery, which must hide itself from the popular gaze. The deeper it is looked into, the more it is admired, and loved, and cherished. It is hidden, not because it is concealed, but because the grace and glory thereof cannot now be fully seen by mortal eye, or heard by mortal ear, or enter into the soul of man to be fully conceived. The Lord taught the people, and raised up men in the Church, age after age, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, who continued the same blessed work, and thus the nations learned those sublime maxims of religion and morality, which are now universally accepted as the groundwork of the highest form of civilization and as the only guarantee of human progress and redemption. Gibbon wrote a very able work on the decline and fall of the Roman empire, in which he betrays no small measure of malevolent hate against Christianity, as the cause of the decline and downfall of Roman civilization, and the ruin of the brilliant institutions of the empire. Had he been able to divest himself of his low and vulgar prejudices, and to raise himself up to the broad and generous level of evangelical propagandism, as this stands prominent in all the colossal movements of Christian ages, and gives tone and vigor to the progressive energies of modern times, he would have found a thousand reasons to admire and extol the grandeur and beneficent glory of the force, that pulled down the institutions of pagan Rome, and reared upon the ruins thereof that new order of civilization, which history and science join to celebrate, as the sum of all that is dear and ennobling to man.

But let us come now to a few specific facts, by which these general statements may be corroborated and the subject of religious ideas be made to stand in its own practical light.

The Church was concerned primarily with the spiritual wants of men, but her manner of meeting these was such as ultimately

involved all the issues of life. The inauguration of the gospel was no mere scheme of moral or religious reform, but it was the beginning of a new life, the introduction of a world revolutionizing and world saving power. To the individual, it opened and explained the mysterious enigma of his being, gave him the key to his origin, and his condition and destiny, and imbued him with proper conceptions of his dignity and rights. To such lessons men every where listened, and hence a new light shone in upon their souls. They began to think, not only of their personal regeneration, repentance, piety and holiness, but also of their inalienable rights, and carried with them these progressive ideas of the gospel, into all the relations of life. Where the pagan order of civilization still holds full sway, the individual will lay his head on the block, or disembowel himself, in obedience to blind force or irresponsible power, whilst in Christian lands he demands a hearing and insists upon his chartered rights. Whence this difference? Undoubtedly paganism is blind, selfish, tyrannical, because it is of man; but Christianity, being of God, is true, just, pure, beneficent. The one degrades man and takes away his most sacred prerogatives; the other elevates and saves him in all his relations. In a word, the religion of Jesus places man into a normal relation and urges him forward to a normal destiny; whereas all other systems and schemes, whether ancient or modern, have always failed to comprehend his real condition and to give him proper impulses.

Among the many evils which Christianity found in the world, the institution of slavery was a very general one, and very difficult to correct and remove, because it was so intimately interwoven with the prejudices and material interests of society. Any direct interference with it could not have succeeded, nor does it appear, that it would have been a benefit to either bond or free, if revolutionary measures could have at once been carried into effect. At any rate, the Church did not pursue that course, and yet she undertook the benign task of emancipation from the very start in every legitimate way, and her efforts have been crowned with glorious success. She used no carnal weapons, however, but conquered by the force of religious ideas.

The dogmas of individual rights, dignity and destiny, heralded by Christ and His Church are inimical to all forms of human oppression and bondage, and these dogmas corrected ideas and put the question of emancipation on moral grounds. Heathen philosophy recognised no higher motives in the matter than those of political necessity, and it is easy to see, therefore, considering the political and moral condition of the world, that the task was not only difficult, but that it required the pious and self-denying efforts of ages. The genius of ecclesiastical propagandism was radical and revolutionary in the fullest and best sense. It did not stop with the settlement of dogmas and the spread of ideas, but led to the destruction of the institution with which it was concerned. In this manner was there introduced into modern civilization that element of progress, which has since accomplished such gigantic results. The tenor of ecclesiastical legislation on this subject is extremely interesting. The degrading tenets of heathenism were at once and forever rejected, and slavery was dealt with, not as a normal development, but as an evil brought in by sin. Individual theologians and particular sections of the Church may have revived the disgraceful heresies of the ancient world, but the living preponderating mass of Christian thinking has always been true to the tenor of the gospel, and the work of modern emancipation is the fruit of the ideas and self-denying labors of the covenanted followers of Jesus Christ.

Public beneficence is also a distinctively Christian production, and it stands prominent as one of the benign monuments of Christian ideas. It was begotten by that same spirit, which broke the bonds of the slave, and left the oppressed go free. A common human origin and a common destiny by faith in Jesus Christ, laid hold on the sympathies of men, and the work of Christian charity commenced. The Saviour was full of love and mercy, why should not His people be inspired by the same spirit? How could they worship at the foot of the Cross, and not remember the widow, and the orphan, and the sick, and the poor, and the oppressed, and the captive? Such were the objects and motives that first gave rise to hospitals, and asylums and

associations for the work of charity. It was an undertaking of no small magnitude, and it required efforts and sacrifices of the noblest and yet most trying character. The movement came in conflict with the prejudices and selfishness of the world, and the Church was poor and persecuted, but a strong, honest Christian conviction inspired the disciples of Jesus, and hence success was sure to follow. At this age of our era, when the establishment of benevolent institutions is the order of the day, and when benevolent habits are common in society, we find it difficult to appreciate the difficulties that stood in the way of Christian beneficence in the earlier ages of the Church. Could we transfer ourselves back to those ages and realize the state of things that then existed, we would then be more capable of feeling how much we owe to the force of the religious ideas, which gave nerve to our primitive Christian ancestry to undertake and accomplish the work. Individual beneficence may exist where religious ideas are not in force, but public beneficence never can. It is the warm pulsating flow of Christian piety alone, that can give proper vigor and impetus to measures of public charity, and make society forget its own selfish interests in the generous work of relieving the unfortunate and the needy. And as the Church has done this great work, when all the world had neither the will nor the moral capacity to undertake it, to her, under God, belongs the honor of having infused a generous spirit into society, and of having laid the foundations of modern benevolence.

One of the principal elements of the social economy is the family, and the happiness of individuals, and the prosperity of nations depends in a great measure on the religious ideas, by which this institution is governed and guarded. Where it is left to the promptings of individual caprice, and stripped of the dignity of a sacred divine order, sacred both in law and public opinion, society cannot but be destitute of a high moral tone, and at the mercy of such disorganizing tendencies as will blast the connubial bliss of households and hasten the downfall of nations. The voice of history cannot be mistaken on this subject. It speaks in thundering tones. The civilization of Greece and

Rome carried with it a wholesome degree of moral earnestness, in reference to this matter, in the early history of those nations. In fact the institutions of Romulus made the marriage tie indissolvable, and, although the twelve tables allowed the freedom of divorce to the husband, the republic had stood five hundred years when the first instance of divorce took place, and then the measure was loaded with public opprobrium. While this state of the popular mind lasted, the nation maintained its liberties; but, when they began to grow indifferent to the sanctity of the marriage relation, corruption of manners gained full sway, legal checks could no longer be enforced, and the republic perished. In modern history, we have the appalling facts of the famous French revolution, as a solemn warning. That revolution swept away the usages of ages and tore up by the roots the sanctity of religion. It made special war against the marriage contract, and in the space of two years and three months, it effected six thousand divorces in the city of Paris alone. The results of this infamous frenzy are well known. Now if heathen antiquity and modern infidel madness have reaped such bitter fruits from leaving marriage at the mercy of unrestrained passion and caprice, is it not high time that Christian nations, at the present day, and especially the American people, should begin to inquire, whether we have not been carried into the same downward course and are drifting towards the same whirlpool of social and national ruin?

Let it not be forgotten, that Christianity is the mother of our modern civilization. The Church, in all ages, has sustained the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage bond; and she has, therefore, been the chief instrument in organizing society in its present form. The Catholic Church of the middle ages, is charged with wholesale corruption and apostasy. So far do many go as to make her the synagogue of the devil, which could but cripple the energies, and blast the hopes of nations. No one, however, who has looked into history with an unprejudiced eye, will pretend to deny, that, in spite of her apostasy and corruption, she has firmly maintained the orthodox Christian dogma of the divine institution of marriage, and manfully resisted the

dissolution of the marriage bond, and that, therefore, the colossal moral revolution of the medieval period, and the triumphant success of modern civilization, are mainly due to her influence. Protestantism is firmly committed to the same dogma of the divinity and sanctity of the institution. Yes, it lays claims to even greater evangelical earnestness, and an incomparable superiority in morals. Who now is responsible for some of our recent astounding developments in reference to divorce? Our laws and manners are not what they were a quarter of a century ago relative to this subject. We are evidently drifting away from the ancient religious foundations, and are giving ourselves up to the misery, the caprice, the shame of a godless nationality.

If this is not so, what then mean these frequent divorces? We count them by hundreds, and even thousands, in a single State annually, and no measures are taken, either by the people or the Churches, to change the laws, or to reform public opinion. If religious ideas have not lost much of their force among us, and we have not unconsciously fallen in with the infidel spirit of the times, and are now swooning under the fearful nightmare of an appalling religious indifference or scepticism, why then this popular listlessness with regard to a matter so closely interwoven with the social, moral, religious, and political welfare of the country? The time for alarm and for action has come. It is the business of the States to see that the laws are corrected, but the reform of public opinion lies principally with the churches, and with the educational agencies of the land. If these fail to realize the solemnity of their trust, and check not the licentious tendencies and caprices of the hour, national degeneracy will run its course, and the destruction of our republican liberties will be certain to follow.

The Sunday question, which now extensively agitates the popular mind, may also claim some attention in this connection. It will not be necessary to take into consideration the orthodoxy of the theological opinions, which have ruled much of our American thinking on the subject of the Sabbath. We are not called upon to decide, whether the more stringent or the more liberal views of evangelical Christendom must be taken, as the

true sense of the Gospel. All we need say here is, that the Sunday, as it has been observed among us, is a religious institution, established, guarded, and preserved by the religious ideas of the American people, and as such it was one of the main elements of our past national strength and popular freedom. A wholesale departure from our deep, moral earnestness in reference to this question, would no doubt be a national calamity. We need not dwell upon it now, however, as it is already fully before the public mind, and will, doubtless, be brought to a satisfactory settlement. But, perhaps, it will be necessary to repeat, that it is one of those peculiar institutions and sources of good manners, which religion alone can establish and maintain. If the force of religious ideas be destroyed, the Sabbath, or Lord's day, will be but a mockery. All sacred or festive seasons must necessarily be backed and supported by the strong motives of popular piety, or cease to be bulwarks of public order and national prosperity.

There are other facts that might be brought forward as belonging to the same order with those had under discussion, but we have been sufficiently particular to show the practical bearing of our subject, and to prove the force and absolute necessity of religious ideas. Shall we now plead for the future maintenance of such ideas, and for the support of the institutions necessary to give them proper practical force and vigor? It might be taken for granted, that a Christian people of such noted intelligence, moral earnestness, and piety, as we generally receive credit for, would not need any appeals of this sort. But, alas, experience proves only too conclusively, that the interests of private and public morality can no where be left to undirected popular impulse. Our very freedom demands the constant presence of organized Christian effort, and of the most powerful Christian motives. Intelligence and sound Christian morality are the only safeguards of our institutions, and these require the support of orthodox and liberal Christian ideas. Are we in a condition to meet the exigencies of the times, and to preserve the glorious birthright bequeathed to us by our fathers?

Germany has had her reign of scepticism and rationalistic infidelity. The master minds of that country took their refuge to the simple Christian faith, as it has ruled the world for eighteen hundred years, as the only ark of safety, for both them individually, and the nation. Upon this foundation they planted themselves, and made it the rule of all their thinking, and of all their endeavors. They have given us a fresh, a vigorous, a live Christological theology, which is not only firmly grounded in biblical lore, but deeply rooted in the historic Christological mysteries of the Church Catholic of all ages. With these weapons they entered the arena, and beat the enemy, and the saving power of true sacramental Christian piety is once more successfully restored in the land of the Reformation. If this was the only means of redemption for the great Germanic nationality, with its characteristic intellectual vigor, and high scientific and literary culture, how much more does our young, practical Anglo-American nationality need the simple, but potent facts of the gospel, as a solid basis of its moral and political destiny! Of all the moral and spiritual potentialities the world ever knew, that of the personality of Jesus Christ stands without a parallel. The world has been unconsciously drawn towards it, and ruled and regenerated by it; and in it centres the life and the hope of the world, now and forever. Then let American mind, American piety, American civilization, be ever brought into living contact with this personality; conceived, born, afflicted, and dead; but risen and ascended, and sitting at the right hand of the Father in glory, head over all things to the Church; let, we repeat it, our American nationality, in its civil, moral, and religious integrity, ever be brought into living relationship with the personality of the God-man, Jesus Christ, and this nation will stand a monument, not only of increasing greatness, and popular prosperity, but of Christian purity, and progressive generosity.

It is easy to see, then, that no order of piety can satisfy the demands of the times, that is not in living sympathy with the deep, Christological ideas of the past. It must find its proper home and support in the sacramental order or economy, which we call the Church. No religious or pietistic sentimentalism

will answer. The issues of the age are by far too potent and too radical to be mastered by anything short of a popular Christian consciousness, that comes supported by all the force of Christian antiquity, and moves, throughout, with the dignity and the unction of a divine economy. The old ideas of the kingdom of grace, or of the Covenant—of the altar, of the ministry, of the sacraments, of worship, of the Church as a whole—must once more become familiar to the people, in order that the nation and the world may be saved. This is no revival of sectarian narrowness and bigotry; it is the plea of Christian civilization over against the misery and helplessness of the uncovenanted world. It involves all the practical issues of the age, and must be considered in connection with all the interests of mankind. The movement is, however, not a mechanical one—a mere return to the traditions and customs of the past. No, the spirit of the times moves in no such fixed grooves. The process, though historical and conservative, is still free and progressive. It must be in living sympathy and rapport with the Creed, and all its legitimate associations, in ancient and modern times. In a word, it must be truly and absolutely Christian, and assert its divine claims and prerogatives in the world, in a truly historical and sacramental way; and thus sustain, and preserve, and bring to its final perfection, the glorious work of human redemption, as this was begun and continued by the same order of divine life in days gone by.

We are well aware, that this view of the case does not agree with the reigning religious thinking of this country; for our American Christianity is prevailingly of a spiritualistic order, and looks with suspicion upon every movement, that indicates the revival of deep Christological ideas. Yet it is clear on all hands, that a radical revolution in American theology is already fully inaugurated, and that our Churches are unconsciously, perhaps, but irresistibly drawn into the current. What a difference there is, for instance, between the popular religious temper of to-day, and twenty or more years ago, with reference to church architecture, religious culture, Christian festivals, public worship, and other questions of the same kind! Then,

the Creed, the Cross, the Festivals, Books of Common Prayer, and every thing of that kind, was denounced as a relic of Popery, and as inimical to spiritual or evangelical religion; now Unitarianism, and New England Puritanism, are even becoming reconciled to these ancient symbols and customs, and some of their leading minds begin to look upon them, as an essential measure to save American Protestantism from ultimate dissolution and ruin. If we consider the self-sufficient tone of this same order of American religious life some years back, we might regard it as somewhat surprising, that its temper has so soon been changed. The case assumes, however, a different aspect, when the instinct of self-preservation is taken into view, and when we remember that there has been a revival of a live, Christological, or Christo-centric theology, both in Europe and in this country, which has made itself felt in many circles, where at first it was not, by any means, cordially received.

What a time there was, when Mercersburg began, with characteristic fervor and integrity, to lift up her voice against the dangerous popular heresies of the day, and to promulgate those Christological ideas that have since become so familiar to our people. There was one universal burst of indignation, coming from professedly evangelical quarters, and hurling the charge of heresy against Mercersburg and the German Reformed Church, for reviving what was then regarded as the errors of Romish superstition, and for opposing what was taken to be the only true form of spiritual Christian piety. But those days are gone, and so is much of the indiscreet zeal, that was then volunteered in our behalf. Since then things generally have slightly changed, and so have theological opinions; not among ourselves only, but elsewhere also. It gives us pleasure to know, that we were among those who led the way, and that others have seen fit to follow with us. We may not receive credit for anything of this kind, but that makes no difference, if only the interests of religion, and of humanity are secured. With a view to that end, we have discussed the subject of religious ideas, and urged the demands of modern civilization. Sure we are, that this question demands a hearing all the world over, and

especially in our own land, and that it cannot be ignored with impunity by either American politics or religion. The dawn of a new era is upon us. Let us see that we mistake not its prophetic forebodings. Live facts are stronger than prejudice, and that theology which is fullest of the mystical, world-historical life of the incarnate Saviour, will doubtless gain the day.

ART. IV.—THE SECOND ADAM, AND THE NEW BIRTH:

Or the doctrine of Baptism as contained in Holy Scripture. By the Rev. M. F. Sadler, M. A., Vicar of Bridgwater. Author of "The Sacrament of Responsibility." From the Second enlarged London Edition. Baltimore, Md. Joseph Robinson, 1862: pp. 244.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, A. M., CAVETOWN, MD.

An interesting volume, worthy of being read and studied by ministers and lay members of the Christian Church. Its object, as the author says, "is to give, in as plain terms as possible, the Scripture testimony to the doctrine of the Initial Sacrament." Its language is plain, and the book is calculated for all classes of readers, and is really "a hand book of Scripture reference on the subject of Baptismal doctrine." The subject of "Baptismal doctrine" is here presented in such a light, that the importance of it cannot escape the attention of the earnest reader, no matter how little he may be inclined to believe, that grace is really offered in sacramental transactions. It is really an exhaustive Scripture argument on the doctrine of Holy Baptism as taught in the Word of God, and believed by the Christian Church, when "one Baptism for the remission of sins" is confessed. In a work of this kind, so thoroughly scriptural, little room is allowed for criticism, and it will, accordingly, be our object to show, as well as we can, the line of argument followed by the author, in the unfolding of his subject.

Of late years the importance of the doctrine of Holy Baptism has received more attention than formerly. It cannot be denied, that there has been a serious falling away from the doc-

trine as originally held, and that there is room still for the charge, is evident from the little account made of it, as may be inferred from the few baptisms, comparatively, reported in large and influential denominations. And it is but fair to say, that all this falling away took place in the face of creeds and confessions, distinctly asserting, that *grace is offered in baptism*, which, however, have been repudiated as "fossil relics," and these old, apostolic landmarks, have been flung to the winds. In this way there has been a silent process going on, undermining this old, ancient faith, which acknowledged "one Baptism for the remission of sins," and the way has been, and is now, preparing for a reign of rationalism and infidelity, surely coming, which will try our "Evangelical Protestantism" to the very utmost when contending for mastery. This question of Baptism lies at the very threshold of a sound, orthodox theology, and the denial of its importance has been conceding ground into the hands of the enemy, which is beginning to tell in this fearful struggle. The question is fundamental.

It cannot be disguised, that from this stand-point there spring two theories, advocated by men of talent and influence; the one insisting on the necessity of Baptism, and so an ingrafting into Christ, because of original depravity; while the other denies such necessity, and is willing to believe, that it is useless, and that all children, baptized or not, are in the same condition; and that the Sacrament of Baptism gives no advantage by conferring grace. That this latter view is wide-spread, is evident from the fact, that so little stress is laid on the rite; and in our own denomination (with a little change in the view we have quoted), it is held by some, "that Baptism does not make our children Christians; they are such before baptism." * In opposition to views like these, this book comes, with a force that cannot be resisted, and proves, by the Word of God, that they are untenable, contrary to the teaching of the Reformers, and con-

* This idea is erroneously attributed to Ursinus, and that he did not hold a sentiment like this is ably shown in the Oct. No. of this Review: Art. "The old distinction between 'Gemeinde' and 'Kirche.'"

trary to the faith of the Ancient Christians, as well as the teaching of the Apostles.

What is our state by nature? Are children, as above quoted, Christians before Baptism? The answer to an inquiry like this, is distinctly given by the Word of God, and as it was held by the Christian Church always, as expressed in Creeds and Confessions. Here there can be no uncertain sound. Take, for instance, the following, taken from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith: "They (our first parents) being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation." "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." "Original sin is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way, are conceived and born in sin." So the Augsburg Confession. * * * "Since the fall of Adam all men, who are naturally born, are begotten and born in sin." So also Luther's Catechism, and our own Heidelberg Catechism. Quest. 7 and 8. Then, too, Ps. li. John iii. 6, &c., &c. What is to be made out of this belief coming down through ages? Is it a fact, so clearly stated, and firmly asserted; and is the contrary view unscriptural and untrue? So it is affirmed, and the denial of this doctrine has been declared, over and over again, as heresy. It is easy to see now, that, starting from such a premise, fundamental as it is, heretical as it has been declared, the poison from it will flow through all the teaching and preaching, and become the source of endless mischief, and, perhaps, to many a soul, of spiritual shipwreck. There are some, and the number may be large, of the ministry and the laity, who cannot frame their lips to say, much less in heart believe, "that they present this child, and seek for it deliverance from the power of the Devil, the remission of sin, and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost," &c.; and then, "Do you, in the name of this child, renounce the Devil with all his ways and works, the world with its vain pomp

and glory, and the flesh with all its sinful desires." And yet Reformers taught it, and Ancient Christians believed it.*

An interesting question now arises: Whence does this depravity come? How are children affected by being born by natural generation? Are they, in that innocent state, Christians before Baptism, without any stain, or without being "conceived and born in sin," as we are often told, and as is taught? Here, again, there is no uncertain sound. The Christian Church has but one voice on the subject—our own Catechism is most explicit on this point. The Word of God is decided. Then the clear statement of the author, "God, in His all-wise purpose, ordained that the race of mankind should spring from one parent. Adam was the fountain from which the whole river of human being was to flow. He was the root from which the whole tree of human life was to spring. God ordained, that he should transmit his human nature, whatever that nature might be, to his posterity, so that, if he continued holy, he should transmit to them a holy nature; but that if he became sinful, he must, of necessity, transmit to them a sinful nature. Through his own free will he ate of the forbidden fruit, and became sinful; and this before any children had been born to him; so that when he begat children, he transmitted to them, not the sinless nature which he possessed originally, but the sinful nature which he received the moment he transgressed. Hence the fountain of human nature became poisoned at its source; the root of human nature became evil before a single branch or bud had sprung out of it. Hence, when Adam begat children, they were in his likeness. Hence all mankind are sinners from the womb. . . . . We find the children of godly parents, who have seen in their parents a holy example, show the same seed,

---

* In the Palatinate Liturgy of 1563, in the form of Baptism, in the address, it is said, " . . . that it be trained up in the Lord Jesus Christ, and admonished, that by the reception of the sign and seal of this divine covenant, in Baptism, it renounced the *devil and the world,* with all their works and lusts," &c. Query. If it renounced the devil and the world, did the framers of this old, venerable German Ref. Liturgy, believe, that children were under that power, and is that, in the "Order of Worship," something new, or an innovation?

and of evil as the children of the ungodly." p. 8-9. There is something wonderful in this awful mystery; and yet there is the fact, that in a state of unconsciousness, there is the transmission of moral evil—planting in the offspring the seeds which ripen in sin. The human family is not to be conceived as atomistic, where each one is for himself, becomes what he is by imitation; but as one whole, in which each one stands in a life common to all. In this view, each one (and this will be so to the end of time) "is conceived and born in sin." "Our first parent, in whose loins were all his posterity, sinned, and so received into his nature the seeds of corruption, both moral and physical; and he begat children in his own likeness—not only with outward frames like his, but with souls like his in their taint of evil. And he transmitted to each one, that was engendered of him and of his offspring, the corruption he had received. To each unconscious babe he transmitted the corruption which he himself had received in a state of the highest moral consciousness." Rom. v. 12, 14, 19, p. 10. It is clear, that all are involved in the fall, and share in the bitter consequences; and that, in this state, "we are wholly incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all wickedness." In Adam all is lost. Shall there be now no release, for infants as well as adults, from this state of sin? Have we not an intimation of redemption in the promise made at the first? "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." A remedy for sin was to be provided, and the woes of humanity relieved. Man had fallen, but God provided a Redeemer.

In the sublime fact, "The Word was made flesh," we have an act of love surpassing comprehension. In Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, we have gained what was lost by the first. Here we have an entrance into our life of one "not born in the way of nature, but by miracle"—not in sin, as every other human being had been born, but sinless: one of whom alone it could not be said, "He was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did his mother conceive him." He was man, in all points, like unto us, sin

excepted, "so that the same human nature which had sinned should likewise make satisfaction for sin;" and he was divine, "that he might, by the power of his Godhead, sustain, in his *human nature*, the burden of God's wrath," *etc.* Man had fallen, the race was corrupt, the Redeemer had to impart a new life, so that man could be forgiven and pardoned. In order to this, a source of life had to be opened—the moral corruption of our nature had to be counteracted—the seed of sin, ending in death, rooted up, so that life and health could be imparted. In the Person of our Blessed Lord, we have the Second Adam—the fountain of a new order of life to the world. He, in and by whom sin is forever destroyed—the Bread of Eternal Life—the fountain of Living Water. As in Adam, the race starts and flows on continually, every member of it sharing in the corruption—in sin: so in Jesus Christ, a new life starts, of a higher order, in which life, in some way, every one must share, in order to obtain eternal life. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." To effect this end, it pleased God, in Infinite Wisdom, to insert into our sinful race this sinless One, to atone for sin, and to restore unto it righteousness and Life. As our Mediator, he offered Himself for the race, and in some way, mysterious to the human mind, God accepted the offering, that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." As in Adam, we have opened the fountain of corruption, ever repeating itself in the transmission of moral evil, so in Jesus Christ there is opened the fountain to Life. "The first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening (*i. e.*, life-imparting) Spirit." 1 Cor. xv. 45. But how can this be? How can Christ, the Life, so impart Himself to His people, to be Eternal Life to them? The author answers, "By the power of the Holy Ghost. The especial work of the Holy Ghost, in the economy of Grace, is to make Christ present. The Spirit does not, in this dispensation, regenerate and strengthen man by Himself, as it were, but by the very life and strength of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ,—Christ, not as God, for as God He is every where, but the

whole Christ—the Christ who is "perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." "I mean a mystical and supernatural presence—a presence for the most wondrous and gracious of purposes, to make us partakers of a new life,—but, withal, a presence infinitely above our comprehension, because the presence of the nature of one infinitely above our comprehension; because, again, the presence within us of the nature of a spiritual body, of which spiritual body we know nothing. I mean a presence above nature, and brought about in a way infinitely above nature, through the power and working of God's Almighty Spirit." That this is no new view, but reaches far back, is seen from the following extract: "To all things He (Christ) is life, and to men light as the Son of God. . . . Adam is in us as an original cause of our nature, and of that corruption of nature which causeth death: Christ as the cause original of restoration to life. The person of Adam is not in us, but his nature, and the corruption of his nature derived into all men by propagation: Christ, having Adam's nature as we have, but incorrupt, deriveth not nature, but incorruption, and that immediately from His own Person, into all that belong unto Him. As, therefore, we are really partakers of the body of sin and death received from Adam, so, except we be truly partakers of Christ, and as really possessed of His Spirit, all we speak of eternal life is but a dream. Doth any man doubt but that even from the flesh of Christ our very bodies do receive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day, and for which they are accounted parts of His blessed body? Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with His body, which is incorruptible, and that His (body) is in ours as a cause of immortality, a cause by removing through the death and merit of His own flesh that which hindered the life of ours. Christ is therefore, both as God and as man, that true Vine whereof we both spiritually and corporally are branches," *etc.* Eccles. Pol. Book V., Ch. 46, Sec. 9.

"Still it (the flesh of Christ) is properly said to be life-giving, as it is pervaded with the fulness of life for the purpose

of transmitting it to us. . . . Accordingly, he shows that in His humanity also fulness of life resides, so that every one who communicates in His flesh and blood, at the same time, enjoys the participation of life. As water is at one time drunk out of the fountain . . . . so the flesh of Christ is like a rich and inexhaustible fountain, which transfuses into us the life flowing forth from the Godhead into itself. Now, who sees not that the communion of the flesh and blood of Christ is necessary to all who aspire to the heavenly life? Hence those passages of the Apostle: The Church is the 'Body of Christ,' 'His fulness,' 'He is the Head, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase of the body.' Eph. i. 23; iv. 15, 16. Our bodies are the 'members of Christ.' We perceive that all these things cannot possibly take place unless he adheres to us wholly in body and in spirit. But the very close connection which unites us to His flesh, he illustrated with still more splendid epithets, when he said that 'we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones.' Eph. v. 30. At length, to testify that the matter is too high for utterance, he concludes with exclaiming 'This is a great mystery.' Ep. v. 32." Calvin's Institutes, Book IV., Chap. 17, Sec. 9.

To effect the object of the Redeemer's mission, and to carry on this great work, in and for His people, He institutes His Church—His Body—in which He is ever present, according to His own promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." This is a glorious order from God, let down from heaven—an order supernatural—possessing forces and powers for the great purposes of human redemption. It is not a system of doctrine, not a scheme or system of religion, "but it is a heavenly, spiritual state of things, introduced by our Saviour, for the purpose of counteracting a carnal, sinful state of things, introduced into the world by the sin of the first Adam." In this order, salvation *only is possible*, as the *Presbyterian Confession* says, concerning the Church, "*out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.*" But how shall that which is born of the flesh obtain entrance into this "heav-

only state of things?" Is there a necessity to enter? Assuredly. Entrance into this glorious order is alone by complying with the terms of admission, "He that believeth and is *baptized*." There is something wonderful in all this, that to an entrance into that order where life is, the immortal spirit should consciously recognize the Redeemer and lay hold on His blessed offers, and yet that all this should be in connection with the washing, as declared by "being baptized." How different this from the theory held and taught in our day. The New Birth is looked upon as the same event in the history of the soul, in which there is a turning from the world to God, making our ingrafting into Christ and conversion one and the same fact; and yet our Divine Redeemer lays down a different order when Nicodemus inquires from Him, and there again connects this New Birth with water, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." So again in the Apostolic commission, "Go ye, *therefore*, and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. So, too, after the effusion of the Holy Ghost, when the Living Truth came to the hearts of the people, and three thousand anxious souls asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" we have again the water, "a *baptism for the remission of sins*." Acts ii. 38. In the case of Saul, who persecuted the Church, when God confronted him, and when the glorified Redeemer said to him, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," this converted man was directed to go to Damascus, and there he should be told what to do, and here again we have the water, "Arise, and *be baptized, and wash away* thy sins." Acts xxii. 38. Another world from that which would have said, Come to the anxious seat and be converted. Whether all this is to be set down as a "Romanizing tendency," or whether it is to be regarded as "High Church Puseyism," or "Extreme Ritualism," there we read it—so it was believed—so the Lord Jesus taught.

What shall this entrance, by Baptism, into this supernatural order be called? What is the relation which it effects? It is incorporating (*einverleibet*) into Christ—grafting into Him, who is the Second Adam. Our author calls it "the Grace of Re-

generation. Regeneration is that in the Kingdom of God, which answers to original sin in the kingdom of evil. As original sin is the partaking of Adam's nature, so regeneration is the partaking of Christ's." What is Regeneration? A gifted writer answers: "It is the effect of that gift of grace which the Father of all mercies was pleased to embody in the manhood of the Incarnate Son, that thereby humanity at large might be re-constructed: and which, in Him and by Him, is received by those happy members of the family of man to whom the Gospel comes, and by whom it is not rejected through unbelief or impenitence. . . . . *It is Christ taking up His dwelling in man.*" Let us be careful and not confound terms. Regeneration is not Conversion, neither is it repentance. Being born again, is "by water and the Spirit." To apply the word regeneration, as is ordinarily done, to conversion, is systematically to ignore that *initial* grace, which is given to men as the foundation, so to speak, the root of future "newness of life," continual daily turning to God. "Regeneration and Conversion are two different terms, differently derived, presenting two different ideas—the one *birth*, at the commencement of a life; the other, turning in the middle of a walk. They are never interchanged in Scripture. I do think these considerations, if realized, shut us up, as it were, to the one change that the Church has always attached to these words—the Baptismal grafting into Christ." p. 25. In this act, then, there is a grafting into Christ—the implanting of a Divine Seed—the root for future "newness of life." That this ingrafting is not the same as Conversion is clear, and these terms were held separate from the earliest times. So Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 61. . . . "Afterwards they are brought by us to a place where there is water: and after *the same manner of regeneration that we were regenerated by, are they also regenerated:* for they then receive a washing in water in the name of the Father of all things, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit." Luther says: "And hence has Baptism such virtue and energy (as the Holy Ghost witnesseth by St. Paul) that it is the laver of Regeneration, and of the renewal of the Holy Ghost: by which laver

the impure and sentenced nature which we draw from Adam is *altered and amended;*" and Calvin, also, "By Baptism we were *initiated* . . . into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

With this preparation, and the arrangements made for the development of a new life, the question comes up, "Who are the proper recipients of that Sacrament which our Lord has ordained as the means of engrafting men into His Body?" to which our author answers, "All those who partake of the nature of the first Adam." All who partake of the condemnation of the first Adam, have a right to the grace offered in the Second. But not all are fitted to enter, and yet all, without exception, are in original sin. Only infants, and those that repent and believe, and *are baptized.* At the first adults were baptized, because then the very name of Christ was unknown, but this was an unusual state or condition of things. "But this surely was not to be the *normal* state of things." "I believe, then, that the New Testament was written, not for the age of the Church in which the Gospel was preached to unbelievers, but for those many successive ages that have succeeded it, in which the children of the Church have been taught more or less of its truths from the earliest dawn of their consciousness. When, then, the New Testament mentions frequently the Baptism of adults, it does precisely what any other missionary record would do." In the Acts of the Apostles, the record of the missionary labors of the servants of God, we have the notice of baptism in the case of those who were led by the Sermon of Peter to ask, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The answer comes, "Repent: and be baptized every one of you . . . . for the promise is to you, and to your children." "They were to be baptized BECAUSE *of the promise;* but the promise belonged *to their children*, as well as to them, consequently Baptism, the seal of the promise, would equally belong to their children; at least, they, being brought up in a religion, the first principle of which was that children should be admitted into a covenant of promise on their eighth day, would assuredly understand it so, if not expressly forbidden." The Sun, in whom all centred, had arisen, "The Word

was made flesh," and in Christ we find the interpretation and completion of all preceding worship and divine acts. But, as before said, the promise was not only to them, *but also to their children*, and they were admitted into peculiar relations to God, by circumcision, God's own appointment. As infants were not disqualified under the Old Testament dispensation, but had to enter solemn relations on their eighth day, on pain of being cut off, neither are they disqualified in this new dispensation; it is rather *the* qualification for these covenant blessings. "But in the Old Covenant it was a fundamental principle to admit children to its blessings, and a rite was ordained for the purpose. This rite was superceded by another, as the form of entrance into the grace of the New Covenant. . . . We should certainly have been told, for instance, that in the three households, of the baptism of which we have a record, there were no children, or that the children in them had their Baptism deferred. . . . If Infant Baptism is practiced at all, it must, of necessity, soon supercede, in a Christian community, the practice of Adult Baptism. If, then, it were contrary to the will of the Divine Founder that infants should be baptized, we should certainly have been warned against it. . . . . We should have expected some such rule as this: "Let not a child be baptized till he is of such an age: till he has had such and such instruction: till he has shown that he has profited under it by the genuine signs of Conversion." "If, then, the baptism of infants be contrary to Christ's will, the omission of all warning against so universal a custom—a custom that so rapidly and so naturally superceded Adult Baptism—is inconceivable." If children are fit subjects for baptism—if it is to be for them a bar to original sin—then baptism must be for them what Christ ordained it, viz: "The communication of Himself as the Second Adam." It is sad to admit that this ancient faith has been undermined, and has given way to a great extent, so that now there is doubt whether, after all, by baptism, infants are ingrafted into Christ, and whether He communicates Himself, as the Second Adam, in this Holy transaction. The very fact that our children are baptized—are covenanted with God—grafted into the Second

Adam, is the source of the greatest comfort to the Christian heart when bereft of them. "They *were suffered* to come to Christ," and in this holy transaction He laid His hand on them and blessed them. What becomes of the unbaptized, not ingrafted child, dying in infancy, it is not for us to say.* So our author says: "They are made partakers of his deadly nature in a state of perfect unconsciousness. When they can do no sin—for they are in the mere germ of existence—they are made partakers of Adam's nature of sin and death. If, then, God has provided a Second Adam (which, blessed be His holy name, He has done,) why should not infants in a like state of helplessness receive in Baptism His nature, in order to counteract that evil, and renew the nature they have helplessly and unavoidably received from the first Adam?" "Regeneration," as has been well said, "is the correlative and opposite to original sin. As original sin is the transmission of a quality of evil, so regeneration is the infusion of a quality of good: as original sin is inherited without the personal act of us who are born of the flesh, so regeneration is bestowed without the personal merit in us who are born of the Spirit: as in the inheritance of original sin we are passive, and unconscious, so in regeneration, when we are baptized as infants, we as passively and unconsciously receive a new nature." Can unconsciousness, then, be made a bar to the reception of the nature of the Second Adam, seeing it is not to the reception of the nature of the first Adam? Taking this view of the case, baptism is indispensable—conveys grace, and the denial of it is one of the most fearful heresies inflicted on Christianity, leaving out, on the wild commons of the world, the infant child, having inherited a depraved nature, and refusing to it to be ingrafted into a new stock in order to partake of a new life. It brings the baptized child into new relations to God and to Christ, even as the circumcised among the Jews were brought into relations to God different from those of the

* It is known to many that a belief prevailed in the church formerly (and perhaps now) that the unbaptized child, dying in infancy, can never become completely happy, or, in other words, can never see the "Beatific Vision."

uncircumcised. On this plane we can see the infused poison, in the rationalism of our day, cropping out, gradually preparing the way for bolder conquests.

That this is no imaginary state—that the relation of the Baptized is what the Sacrament says it is, in other words "that grace is not only offered, but *really exhibited and conferred* by the Holy Ghost,"* is clear from the Word of God. God, in His Holy Word, addressing his children through his servants, proceeds upon this fact, as may be seen from every page. The circumcised people, as well as the baptized member, is always addressed as having received grace,—is addressed as being in a relation different from the individual of the world. Take the following: "Israel is my son, even my first-born." Ex. iv. 22. "Ye are the children of the Lord your God." Deut. xiv. 1. "And when the Lord saw it, he abhorred *them*, because of the provoking of his sons and of his daughters." Deut. xxxii. 19. "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." Isa. i. 2. And so throughout the whole Old Testament Scriptures, His people are addressed as "His children," "His people," "His chosen," "His Bride," etc. etc. And now, *because* they had bestowed upon them such distinguished privileges and favors—because they had been admitted into these peculiar relations, and in these sinned, and did wickedly, and their sins were great, the need of repentance, on the other hand, was so very pressing and so urgent, as we have it from the mouths of the holy prophets. But how were they brought into these relations? How were they brought to share in the privileges God had ordained for them? Decidedly, by Circumcision. Gen. xvii. 9–13. And by this divinely ordained rite, children of Jewish parents entered into covenant relations with God, bringing them under the most solemn obligations to love, obey, and serve God. And this continued in force until this economy was ended by being taken up into a new and higher order when the "Word was made flesh."

---

*..... the grace promised is *not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred* by the Holy Ghost, &c. Confession of Faith—Art. 28. Baptism. Presbyterian Church.

"The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The second Adam is here. The source or fountain of a new order of life is opened, to which we are to come for life, and to whom we are to be supernaturally joined by a union so close "that it could only be illustrated by the union that subsists betwixt a human body composed of various limbs and its head, and a vine and the branches that branch out from it." This kingdom is peculiar, and He who is the Head of it gives us intimations of the real state of it. Take the parable of the tares, Mat. xiii. 24, 25. Then the parable of the draw-net, Mat. xiii. 47 *et seq.*, and also John xv. 1–6; besides many others. And does not this give us an insight into this kingdom? Who can read the Apostolic epistles and believe, though addressed to the "Saints and Faithful," that there was no admixture of evil with good? Indeed Church History gives a history of one continued warfare between evil and good, which seems to repeat itself, even now, in the contests between rationalism and the truth. And yet what advantages have been offered, when it is borne in mind that these "Saints and Faithful" were in a state of grace.

It is clear from the Word of God that two classes are recognized, the one in Grace, the other not. It will assist us greatly in reading the Word of God, to observe this distinction. To this point the author now addresses himself. The apostle addresses his readers and hearers "as in a real state of grace, as all partakers of the Holy Spirit, and baptized *by Him* into Christ's body—not into a mere outward society, but into His *mystical body*." In all his epistles he gives us to understand that great grace is offered, and that this is always conditioned. What is not to be forgotten is that it is really offered—really at hand. In the Epistle to the Corinthians, he addresses it to the "Church of God which is at Corinth," the "Sanctified in Christ Jesus," the "called to be saints." Here we cannot specify, for want of room, but would say that the whole Epistle is framed on this ground, "Of Him are ye in Christ Jesus. Ye are God's husbandry," etc., etc. Take this then as a fact, being in grace, and there is to be deduced a theory far different from our common, and as some would say, "Evangelical Pro-

testantism," which deserves to be sincerely pondered and prayerfully laid to heart. The following inferences are made: "First, you observe that St. Paul's mode of addressing nominal Christians exactly answers to the way in which the prophets treated nominal Jews. In both the one case and the other the real communication of the privilege of the respective covenants, was insisted on, to convince those under the covenants of their greater sin in not living up to the covenant blessings and obligations. The covenant blessing of which the Corinthian Christians had been made partakers, *viz:* grafting into Christ's body in Baptism, was an infinitely greater spiritual blessing than that received by the Jewish child at his circumcision; and yet, in one important respect, they answered to one another. They laid the recipient, in each case, under obligations of which he could never divest himself, and yet which he might receive to his greater condemnation. Then observe, what was St. Paul's fear respecting his converts. It was not lest any should deem themselves to be members of Christ when they were *not*, but lest those who had been *all* made members of Christ should fail to realize it. He casts not the shadow of a doubt on the reality of their engrafting into Christ; on the contrary, he holds all responsible for grace, because all had been engrafted. . . . We find no expression of doubt or hesitation respecting the Corinthians having all received grace. 'Know ye not that your bodies? etc.' 'Ye are the body of Christ, etc.' . . . You will observe, also, how impossible it is to suppose that the apostle addressed his converts on some unreal hypothesis, or imaginary charitable assumption, that they were members of Christ, when in reality they were not; for he intimates in all the expressions that the sin of the Corinthians was immeasurably enhanced by the fact of their actually being members of Christ." pp. 67–68. Then we have an examination into the teaching of the Epistles to the Romans and Colossians, and here we find the same way of proceeding. "In both these Epistles the grace of union with the Second Adam is presented to us as a co-burial and co-resurrection with Christ. We are united to Him not only as an Adam, but as a

crucified and risen Adam. In partaking of Him, we partake both of His death and resurrection; so that the same Baptism which grafts us into Him, is the means by and in which we are co-buried and co-raised with Him." This is seen throughout the whole of the Epistle to the Romans. From this is deduced, "First, that the Apostle contemplates the Baptism of all the Roman Christians, without exception, to be a union with Christ, a grafting into Him as the Second Adam, a co-burial with Him in His burial, and a rising again with Him in His resurrection. He uses the most *inclusive* term, "So many of us," and he appeals to it as an indisputable truth. "*Know ye not*, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?" "Observe, also, that the words of the Apostle here, exactly answer to his mode of speaking to the Corinthians, and have the same practical force." It is not an idle thought to be grafted into Christ, and it is no light matter to let the baptized understand, that there are no baptismal obligations under which they are, and to intimate that no grace has been conferred, and so ignore it. Rather should the fact of grace offered and conferred in baptism, be pressed home upon the conscience and the heart, as the Apostle always does to his hearers and tells them, that because they are *in grace*, because their baptism *has meaning*, because they are engrafted into Christ and thus have great advantages offered, *therefore* "they are to walk in newness of life." The same mode we find in the Epistle to the Colossians, addressed to the "Saints and faithful brethren in Christ." Here again the address is general, and then, in the second chapter, the apostle exhorts these very "saints and brethren in Christ," to constancy, and he challenges them to walk in newness of life, *because* there has been for them a baptism, burial, and resurrection. Col. ii. 12. Indeed, only on the ground of their union with the Second Adam—their engrafting into him by baptism, can you understand the precepts addressed to them. So in the third chapter, children, husbands, wives, servants are addressed, and all, as in a state of grace, and in the case of children, it follows that they, as well as their parents, had been buried with Christ in their baptism.

We have been, so far, free in making extracts from this interesting book, to show the drift of the author's arguments, and we may say, that the same result is reached in the case of the other epistles. There is no singling out, but his address is general, "to the saints and brethren in Christ," Ep. to Gal., iii. 26, etc., the peculiar grace bestowed in baptism is brought forward again, as the incentive to holiness. Any one reading these Epistles, cannot help but see, that by baptism these persons addressed had been brought into a state, in which before baptism they had not been; or, in other words, they teach Baptismal Regeneration, in the sense in which regeneration has been explained, or an ingrafting into Christ, as clearly as they teach and assert the love of God as manifested in Christ Jesus our Lord. Whether the doctrine is horrible or not, there it is, and it requires a perverted mind to read it out these Epistles. "It cannot be alleged that St. Paul had no opportunities of introducing the doctrine of partial grace, or particular election, to the churches which he addressed. Many of them had admitted gross errors into their practice; others, as the Galatians, had swerved widely from sound doctrine; many individuals were "unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers, who subverted whole houses, teaching things that they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." *These corruptions, however, are nowhere attributed to the denial of grace, but always to the abuse or neglect of it.* The Apostle calls the heathen nations "children of wrath, and sinners of the Gentiles," so, equally clear, he intimates that the Christians he addresses were thus regenerate; as having "put off the old man with its deeds," and having become the "temple of the Holy Ghost," and the "members of Christ," as having the spiritual circumcision, and being "buried with Christ in baptism," and as being "washed, sanctified and justified in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." To the Galatians, "bewitched" as he says they were, "that they should not obey the truth," he still writes, "Ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." These addresses and exhortations are

founded on the principle that the disciples, by their dedication to God in baptism, had been brought into a state of reconcilement with Him, had been admitted to privileges, which the Apostle calls on them to improve. On the authority of this example, and of the undeniable practice of the first ages of Christianity, baptism has been held as conveying regeneration, instructing us to pray, before baptism, "that the infant may be born again, and made an heir of everlasting salvation; and to return thanks, after baptism, that it hath pleased God to regenerate the infant by His Holy Spirit, and to receive him for His own child by adoption." This theory, we know, is different from the prevailing theory in our day, and what assumes to itself the name of "Evangelical Christianity," in which theory, the initial sacrament is ignored, and studiously keeps all on the outside, who have not been experimentally converted to God. Indeed, in that scheme, which lifts children, uncovenanted, to heaven, and becomes horrified when hearing of a *limbus infantum*, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, can find no foothold. It shudders at the appellation of "saint and believer," to one, in whose case the apostle stood in doubt, and yet, this is precisely what is done once and again by the same apostle, in the N. T. Epistles. As in the O. T. appellations were used when addressing the whole multitude, so in the N. T. we have the same mode of address in the case of those who were baptized. The address is not made to those who passed through the unmeaning and unscriptural process of conversion, at some newly invented anxious-seat, where there is a total ignoring of all grace, a studious shutting it out from the mind, but it is made to those baptized, and so brought into grace, as a ground or basis upon which their lives are to be governed and controlled. It means to say, to every baptized member, that in some "real sense, baptism separated each man to God's service, and that, if such an one failed to live up to his profession, he was so far a living lie." This modern theory is unknown to the N. T. It is something new. It cannot frame the lip to speak, in a general way, of Christians as "saints, or holy," and yet the apostle does so repeatedly. "You will observe, that

St. Paul constantly uses these appellations, not as implying that his hearers *had* attained superior Christian excellence, but as suggesting a *motive* for their exerting themselves to attain it. He never tells any of them to expect any '*call*,' but addresses them all as 'called saints,' and exhorts them to '*walk worthy* of the vocation wherewith they are called.' He never speaks of them *becoming* elect, but exhorts them, *as* the elect of God, holy (or saints) to put on mercy, kindness, and humbleness, and to give diligence to make their calling and election sure. Never does he exhort them to be saints, but to walk as *becometh* saints, never to *enter into any brotherhood*, but to '*love as*' brethren. The titles, in short, which he applies, all denote their *privileges* and their *duties*, not their good *use* of those privileges, and faithful *performance* of those duties." *Whateley.* Ignore these distinctions, allow the engrafted person to remain under the delusion that there has been no grace conferred, bring him to think only of his conversion at some far off time, at the anxious-seat, and he will feel himself absolved from the Christian covenant, as completely as the untaught heathen. Who does not feel that here we have two theories, one, the scriptural, emphatically affirming grace conferred in baptism,—or an engrafting into Christ by it; and the other denying it, and expecting the regeneration and conversion to be effected during some special excitement, gotten up for the purpose? Does it not bring in a new Gospel, a new theory of Redemption, unknown to the apostle's mind? This latter view holds all unconverted persons alike—that there is no special responsibility imposed on them—that they are as the heathen are, with only this difference, that they have been born in a Christian land, when in fact, because of their baptism, their relation is far different. Is it not true, and who will deny, that a grave responsibility rests upon the teacher of the Word of God—that the ignoring of this grace has much to do with the sad state of affairs every where prevalent, when the young, though baptized, are unwilling to own and acknowledge God by a profession of faith in Christ? "If men are habitually taught that they never begin to be in any sense 'God's people,' or 'holy,' till they are con-

verted, when they are grown to maturity; and when, along with this, they are reminded that they can do nothing to forward this conversion, so entirely is it the work of God; of course under such teaching they hold themselves to be as completely out of the pale, and absolved from the obligations of the Christian covenant as the heathen." And is not this the complexion, the character of the larger percentage of preaching as we now have it in the Protestant Church? Listen to this, and then turn to the addresses and exhortations of the Apostle, as found in his epistles, and you are made to feel that there are two worlds—two orders of thought, in which the speakers move. The Apostle does not know of the modern distinctions of our day, the select few, and of the others still needing regeneration and conversion, as modern revival preachers lustily cry, but he speaks of the great body of the baptized as brought into a peculiar grace, and therefore exhorts them, because of it, to be careful to see to it that they fall not away, but to walk in newness of life, to make their calling and election sure.

But these peculiarities are not confined alone to the Epistles already quoted. The Epistle to the Ephesians is full of the same teaching—the assertion of grace bestowed upon the "Saints and faithful," at Ephesus. The same also is true of the Parables of our Lord, as well as of the remaining Epistles. Carefully examine them. And now, what is the inference from all these facts? Evidently this, that what held in that day in the Church of Christ, must hold in our day—that if the baptized member was by baptism brought into grace, or in other words, grafted into Christ, so must the baptized member be in our day—that if it was fearful to possess such grace and abuse it, so it is now,—that if by it the baptized member was laid under the most solemn obligation to obey and love God, so the baptized member is now. That these persons addressed as "Saints and faithful," were so in the modern sense, cannot be made out, and no one, with an earnest mind, can read the Word of God so. Take the idea of regeneration and conversion, as held in our day, as meaning the truly godly Christian, and in that

light read such passages as Eph. iv. 25, *et seq.;* Col. iii. 18; Heb. xii. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 15. It all "proceeds on the assumption that all to whom they are addressed, have been received, by a past act of God's mercy, into a state of grace and a holy fellowship, which may yet be uncared for and unrealized, and so eventually lost. All are brethren, all are partakers of a calling and election, which they all must give diligence to *make sure.*" It is not to a select few, but the responsibility rests on the whole body of Christians, as is clear. "The precepts and warnings contained in them (the Epistles) can be applied in their entireness to Christians of this our day, only on the principle of Baptismal Regeneration, as held by the Catholic Church; for on this principle, and on this alone, can the mass of nominal Christians be held answerable for having received grace." And, indeed, this principle of the universal diffusion of grace, and the consequent responsibility of the whole body of Christians, is not only implied, but asserted over and over again. So Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vii. 7; xii. 7; xiii. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Gal. iii. 26–28, etc., etc., etc. In all this is implied that baptism is of force—that it confers grace, as is held in all Protestant Confessions—and that because, by baptism, grafted into Christ, the responsibility is so great and the challenge so earnest, that each one is called upon "to make his calling and election sure." It means too, to affirm that the Church is more than a mere idea—that she is truly the Body of Christ—an order of grace let down from heaven, comprehending forces and powers which are not of the world—that here, and not beyond her (as the Presbyterian Confession teaches) salvation is found, and that by nature (without any exception made in favor of children of believing parents) we "are all the children of wrath," and that, in the wisdom of God, He instituted for the Jew circumcision, by which the circumcised entered into fellowship with a grace God had prepared, and in the New Testament economy, by baptism grafted into Christ—made a partaker in the life of the Second Adam, and consequently is called into a relation of holiness, and is bound to obedience, faith and love. "But it is not enough thus to be in Christ, but we must abide

in Him. 'If ye abide in me,' saith He, *implying that some may be in Him, and yet not abide in Him.* Such are they who once were baptized, and so made members of His body, but are afterwards cut off by His Church, or by themselves: such as renounce their Baptism, or leave off to profess His doctrine and religion: and such as only profess it, but do not take care to believe and live according to it."—BEVERIDGE.

In the way of objection, by those who ignore grace in the Sacrament of Baptism, and are alarmed at the very words of Baptismal Regeneration, it is triumphantly asked, is it not written, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new?" How can he be a new creature, if he has never been converted? "The answer to this is, of course, that a man must not only be grafted into Christ, but must *abide* in Him." "We have the whole doctrine of grafting into Christ, and union with Him, and its results, in our Lord's similitude of the Vine and its Branches; and in that similitude He recognizes the awful truth that a man may have been brought unto Him, and yet be barren of the fruits of holiness and goodness here, and be finally lost hereafter." (John xv.). Then the case of Simon Magus is reconciled, and it is added, concerning the unworthy reception of Baptism by an adult, "I cannot see any difficulty in it which is not satisfactorily cleared up by the Scripture analogy of the graft." (Rom. xi. 17–24). Baptism, *no matter what the state of heart of the recipient*, at once brings the baptized into contact (if I may use the expression) with the highest powers of the unseen world. In some infinitely mysterious way, the human graft there and then comes into contact with the new stock of humanity—the Second Adam. If there be faith in the person baptized, he, at once, begins to partake of the root and fatness of the Divine olive-tree, which, if *he yields his will to it*, subdues to itself the whole inner man (1 Jno. iii. 6–9). If he has not faith, the saving efficacy of the grace of Christ enters not into him; *nevertheless he is, all the same, brought into contact with the True Vine*, BUT TO HIS CONDEMNATION. . . If baptism is, no matter what the circumstances, to be adminis-

tered *only once*, it must do its work, and do it *once for all.* And that work can only be the bringing a man, either to his present salvation or to his utter condemnation, into the one family, the gathering him into the one fold, the grafting him into the one stock, the joining him to the one mystical body."

We are aware that baptism has been repeatedly held forth as only a sign, and that it is a beautiful badge of our profession, leaving the whole subject indefinite and indistinct, an avowal of our sincerity, when the truth is, that there is not a single place that can be named, where it is not connected with spiritual grace bestowed in it, and this spirit will say with Faustus Socinus: "Nothing else can be meant, by the washing away of sins by Baptismal water, than that it is declared by the baptism, that the man's sins are already done away, and so this is, as it were, *publicly sealed.*" "Regeneration is the implanted *germ* of a new nature, the infusion of a new leaven, a union with Christ, which may be the smallest thing possible—as small in the eye of man, as a grain of mustard seed, in its beginnings, but then it is calculated and intended to subdue the whole inner man." From all this may be seen "the coincidence of Scripture with this view of Sacramental union with Him, and the exalted position the Saviour has, in Infinite Wisdom, assigned to the Sacrament of Baptism, as the means of making men partakers of His nature."

But then, too, it is said that this view of grace, conferred in baptism, is directly opposed to the doctrine of election and Justification by Faith. This does not of necessity follow. The Scriptures unquestionably teach an election, but then it is asked, "Does He so elect men to His benefits, whatever these are, that they *must* necessarily respond to His election? He certainly did not so elect the Jews: for He elected them to blessings to which they in no respect responded." In the Epistle to the Romans, chaps. 8–11, we have the doctrine of election, if any where in Scripture, and yet these chapters dare not be so isolated from the preceding, and especially from the 6th, where we "have the most decided assertion possible that all the baptized" are buried with Christ by baptism into death;

that like as He (Christ) was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also (*i. e.*, all the baptized) should walk in newness of life." "Again, all the Roman Christians are, without exception, bid to reckon themselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord:" and for this practical end, "Let not sin, *therefore*, reign in your mortal body," etc. This makes all the baptized answerable for Grace. This view was held by rigid Calvinists, as Bradford, and Calvin himself. *Institutes IV. Chap.* 16.

Once more, it is said, that by this theory no room is left for preaching conversion. "It is presumed that the careless and worldly will rest satisfied with their Baptismal engrafting; and make it 'a screen to hide from themselves the necessity of the complete actual change of mind and disposition necessary to them.'" "If such do so, we can only say that they do it in wilful ignorance of the doctrine, and in wilful despite of the grace and intent of Holy Baptism; for what is the doctrine and grace of it?" "We are buried with Christ by Baptism into death, that . . . we *should* walk in newness of life." In no single passage can the doctrine be construed thus. Everywhere it is a motive—an incentive—it tells us that God has an interest in us—that He gave us (baptized) great grace, that so we may walk in newness of life. No one can deceive himself by supposing baptism to be a passport into heaven. It cannot be. "*I never yet met with one such case. The proportion of professing Christians under such a delusion is, I am certain, perfectly inappreciable.*" "But though I have never met with a case of a person who thus abused the doctrine of baptism, I have met with multitudes—and those, I am afraid, but the index of a still larger number,—who abused the opposite doctrine, to the destruction of their souls. I have met with multitudes who have allowed themselves to remain in a state of impenitence, on the plea that they never had had sufficient grace, if any at all, given to them; that conversion was entirely the work of God, and that they themselves could do nothing to forward it, and that they must wait His time. I say that this is, or soon will be, the master-delusion among the unconverted poor. Often it

is said, 'When God wants me, He will call me.' Of course, all idea of the holiness of the human body, is out of the question." Prophetic words from the lips of this Servant of God! "'Baptismal Regeneration' and 'Conversion' are the natural complements to one another in the scheme of Divine grace." "If conversion be preached to Christian congregations, as if they were so many heathen,—if all grace of Baptism is ignored, and the grace attached to it be pronounced real only in the case of those who afterwards profit by some change, not in the least connected with baptism—then, Satan, seeing the way thus cleared for him, will insinuate (as he does in the ears of hundreds of thousands, who hear what is called the Gospel preached,) hat God does not really wish for their holiness; they are as the heathen, why should they not enjoy themselves as the heathen?" Wesley, instrumental in reviving the doctrine of Conversion, says: "By Baptism we are admitted into the Church, and, consequently, made members of Christ its Head. The Jews were admitted into the Church by circumcision, so are the Christians by Baptism." "By Baptism, we, who were by nature children of wrath, are made children of God. And this regeneration, is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith: being grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace." Simeon, quoting Acts i. 38, and 2 Peter i. 9, then asks, "Does not this very strongly countenance the idea which our Reformers entertained, that the remission of our sins; and the regeneration of our souls, are attendant on the baptismal rite?"

There is something practical flowing from this whole subject. Let it be remembered that Regeneration in Baptism is only the seed, not its growth, or development. To the growth or perfection of the plant many other things must contribute. The Providence of God, "must, ordinarily speaking, bring to bear upon the recipient of His grace many things,—such as the care of pious parents, or spiritual pastors: and there must be that divine pruning, or purging, often by sicknesses or calamities, by the distresses attending a hard lot in this world, or by persecution for righteousness' sake, borne meekly and forgivingly after

Christ's example." Besides these, the abundant means which God, in His Providence, bestows to call out the hidden powers of this implanted seed, and to carry it on, in this life, to ripe fruit in the world everlasting. Let it be borne in mind by the deniers that grace is conferred, that it is one thing to have such a benefit bestowed, and quite another thing to hold and realize the doctrinal truth that Baptism is the channel to this grace. And now, practically, to every baptized member, the first and most important result of believing sincerely what God has revealed respecting this sacrament, will be to realize, to every baptized man, that all the precepts of Scripture are *addressed to him:* and if he has turned, or is turning to God, through Christ, that all promises of Scripture *belong to him.* "From the beginning to the end of the Bible, it is taken for granted that those to whom it is addressed are, by an *initial rite, in covenant relationship* with God, and in a *state of grace:* and that those who are thus addressed are not to doubt this, or to wait for something further, but at once to begin in earnest, or to continue in earnest, the working out of their salvation." Then, again, "The Bible is not addressed to, nor intended for, the heathen. The first part of it was inspired for the circumcised Jew: the whole for the baptized Christian. In both cases, God first gathers out a family, and then He gives to this family His word to be their guide." This, again, is something so different from what we find to be the belief and practice of large societies, when it is attempted only to place the Word into the hands of the people, and to scatter it among the heathen as "forest leaves," and that it will be light to them in darkness. Melancthon says: "The principal meaning and end of Baptism we gather from the promise, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;' for Baptism is rightly called a sacrament, because it is annexed to this promise in order to testify that the promise of grace belongs, in very deed, to the man who is baptized. . . . and so, after the man baptized understands (Christian) teaching, let him exercise this faith, let him believe that he is in very deed accepted by God for Christ's sake, and is being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Let it be felt and laid to heart, that, as baptized, God speaks to his soul in His Word,

entreating him to remember, "that his body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. . . . that he is not his own. . . . and, *therefore*, he is to glorify God in body and in spirit, which are God's." Properly laid to heart, it will be a powerful motive to lead a holy life, and diligently to engage "in making His calling and election sure."

Such is the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as unfolded in this volume. Fortified as it is on every side by Scripture, it challenges the earnest and prayerful attention of ministers and laymen. It is not the horrible effusion of an over-heated brain, worthy of being branded "High Church Puseyism," or crying "Romanism," "Romanizing tendency," but a precious Protestant truth, the ingrafting into Christ, for spiritual life, confessed by Christians in all ages, when devoutly affirming "one baptism for the remission of sin," taught by Confessors and Martyrs, Saints and Apostles. It comes as the touch-stone, to test our confidence and our faith in ancient doctrines—it brings out what is held concerning original sin—it reveals in what light we regard the Holy Sacrament of Baptism. All this may be mysterious—it may seem singular that God should attach so much to this rite, and, as the sceptical mind ever says, "I cannot understand this;" and because it cannot see how God can bestow grace, in the case of the baptized infant, therefore it is rejected, and the infant is left out in the uncovenanted wilds of the world to fight its way as it best can. No. Let our Reformed Zion be true to the teaching of her venerable catechism, and faithful to her doctrine as embodied in the venerable Palatinate Liturgy, believed by our pious ancestry before us, in what they regarded as the *Tauf gnade*—reiterated in our Reformed Liturgy now before the Church; and she, continuing faithful in this Reformed-Scriptural doctrine, will be clothed for the contest, which will, assuredly, overtake Protestantism. If God be for us, who may be against us? In the language of the author, "In such a dispensation of grace, it is not for you to ask, 'How can these things be?' Far other words befit a creature redeemed by God Incarnate. Say you rather, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life.' 'Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief.'"

Art. V.—PRESBYTERIAN UNION CONVENTION.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

PART FIRST.

No one, who has come to feel any interest in the *Church Question*, can regard with indifference the movements which are made in favor of union among the different Presbyterian bodies of the country at this time. Whatever may come of them in the end, they form a significant protest against the general wrong of our sectarian Christianity, and show a wholesome uneasiness under the sense of it, which may be taken as a tendency at least in the direction of what is needed to bring the evil to an end. The negotiations which are in progress for uniting again the Old and New School Presbyterians, are in this view of much consequence and account for our American Protestantism generally; but still more worthy of fixed attention, we may say, is the movement brought into view lately for the promotion of unity among all parts and branches of the great Presbyterian communion in the United States, through an overture made for the purpose by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian (Covenanter) Church at its meeting in May last. That the overture should have proceeded from this body in particular, the smallest of any consequence, and, in common estimation, the most stiff of all in its opinions, was of itself remarkable; but that only serves to make more wonderful the responsive echo it has met with from other quarters, as we find full expression given to it in the memorable Union Meeting, which was held a short time since in Dr. Wylie's (First Reformed Presbyterian) Church, Philadelphia. We cannot do better here, perhaps, than to introduce the meeting to the attention of our readers

through the following notice of it by the "New York Observer" the week after it took place.

"One of the most remarkable religious assemblies ever convened in this country was held in Philadelphia last week. It was remarkable, not so much in the object and circumstances of its gathering, as in its pentecostal character, the manifestly overshadowing and pervading influences of the Holy Spirit, and the unanimity to which those who composed it—men of greatly diversified views and feelings—were brought by its deliberations, and by united prayer. We have never before witnessed any general convocation of the officers of the Church upon which a spirit of grace and of supplication was so manifestly poured out, or in which, in answer to prayer, more important results were reached. We cannot but hope that it will exert a great influence in bringing together several portions of the divided Church of Christ.

"The steps which have been taken to effect a reunion of the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church are well known to our readers. The almost entire unanimity in regard to the terms of union to which the two large Committees of the General Assemblies were brought, in their deliberations in this city in April last, was very unexpected, and it greatly encouraged the friends of the measure to hope that the union would soon be consummated. This hope has, during the last few months, been in a measure repressed by the opposition which has sprung up in both branches of the Church, more especially in the Old School, since the meetings of the Assemblies in May; and, although the meeting of the Convention now just held in Philadelphia was anticipated with much interest, it was awaited with no little fear that there would be such a development of opposition from the various branches of the Presbyterian family as to postpone indefinitely the desired union. This led the friends of the measure in all parts of the land to make it the subject of special prayer, and when the delegation to the Convention came together, it was soon manifest that the Spirit of God, which is the spirit of concord, was present."

"The Convention assembled at 11 o'clock on Wednesday,

Nov. 6th. Geo. H. Stuart, Esq., was appointed Temporary Chairman, and was afterward, by acclamation, chosen Permanent Presiding Officer. On taking the chair he called upon the Rev. Mr. Blair, of Pennsylvania, the oldest member of the Convention, and eighty years of age, to lead in prayer. Mr. Stuart then read the 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians:

'I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all, &c.'

He gave out the 100th Psalm, Scotch version:

'All people that on earth do dwell,
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice, &c.';

and addressed the Convention, sounding the key-note to its subsequent character in an address of rare and elevated Christian eloquence. He welcomed the members to this mount of privilege, and to the homes and hearts of the people of the city of Brotherly Love. He spoke of the aims and objects of the gathering as those of peace, of fraternal love. They had not come to promote any selfish or sectarian objects, but to endeavor to unite the scattered members of the Presbyterian family in one, that together they might wage a successful war against the powers of darkness. He referred, in words which melted all hearts, to the union which prevailed among those engaged in the service of the Christian Commission during our late national struggle, when, as they ministered to the dying, and to those who were in perishing need of a Saviour, no one could tell whether his companion was a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, a Baptist or a Methodist. This was the spirit which should animate the ministers and elders of the various Presbyterian Churches. There was nothing that should hinder them from standing side by side in meeting the enemies of our common Christianity, and in laboring to bring the world to Christ. He

said in conclusion: A voice comes to us to-day from the graves of Thomas Brainerd and John M. Krebs, the Chairmen of the Committees on Union of the Old School and New School Assemblies. If we could but hear their voices, we would be greatly encouraged in this good work. My own words in its behalf are poor and feeble when compared with the words of the Apostle:

'That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.'"

After the regular organization of the Convention, it was found to be composed of 180 delegates from the Old School body, 78 from the New School, 26 from the United Presbyterian, 20 from the Reformed, 5 from the Cumberland, and 4 from the Reformed Dutch; *three hundred and thirteen* in all; a most respectable assembly, certainly, as regards numbers, which appears to have been no less respectable, also, in the general character of its members.

"In the afternoon of Wednesday was heard the only discordant note that was struck during all the sessions of the Convention. One of the oldest members, who had been prominent in carrying out the measures which effected the division of the Presbyterian Church in 1837, and who had come to this Convention with the evident purpose to oppose all measures for healing that division, began a course of remark personal and offensive to some of the most esteemed members on the floor of the house. When called to order by the President for his personal reflections, he assumed the attitude of a pugilist, and defied all present, saying that he was responsible for what he said, and that if any one did not like it he would know where to find him. Every one in the house was deeply saddened by the occurrence of such a scene, and for a time it seemed as if the harmony of the meeting was hopelessly broken; and, occurring at the very opening of the business, it was regarded as almost

ominous of a thwarting of the object of the assemblage. But the impression soon passed away—the same voice was not heard again in the Convention, and, until the close, not another note of discord disturbed its harmony."

The voice, which fell thus inharmoniously on the opening spirit of the meeting, as we learn from the regular report of its proceedings, was that of the venerable Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, famous alike in the political world, and in the ecclesiastical. The spirit of the meeting, however, soon recovered itself from the rude shock to which it was thus exposed, and only went forward the more triumphantly afterward, as it might seem, in its own direction, gathering strength, indeed, to go beyond all that was originally proposed in the movement. For, whereas the original overture of the Covenanter Synod appeared to contemplate simply a meeting for prayer and conference, with the view of promoting Christian fellowship and harmonious action between the several bodies that should join in it, hardly had the Convention got properly to work before it became apparent that no such idea of mere federal unity could satisfy its earnest aspirations. It must address itself at once to the task of preparing the way for an organic union. It was, indeed, a proposition to this effect, which had drawn out Dr. Breckinridge's jarring speech. No sooner was that offence got fairly out of the way, therefore, than the whole interest of the Convention was found concentrating itself more and more on the question of union in full form; and a committee was appointed, accordingly, to "prepare and report a basis for the organic union of the Presbyterian Churches."

"The evening was spent in a free expression of the views of the members on the desirableness of union, and as to what the basis should be. It was universally acknowledged, that there must be a spirit of concession in order to secure the important end, and the conference indicated that the subject of Psalmody would prove the most difficult point, many of the members of the United Presbyterian and Reformed Presbyterian Churches adhering rigidly to the position that nothing should be used in

the praise of God but inspired Psalms, or literal versions of some portions of the inspired Scriptures.

"In the course of this conference the President read a letter which he had just received from Rev. Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland, warmly advocating the union of the Presbyterian Churches, and a similar letter from Rev. Dr. Duff was subsequently announced.

"On Thursday the conference was continued, the divine influence which pervaded the assembly becoming more and more apparent. Frequent pauses were made in the proceedings, at the call of the President, for the Convention to unite in silent prayer, the stillness of the crowded house being such that no one whose eyes were closed could be conscious of the presence of another person; and often during the discussions and other proceedings, the President called upon different members to lead in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

Much earnest and affecting oratory on the subject of church union took place in this conference, which tended, continually, to swell the tide of emotion, now running all in one and the same direction. To those acquainted at all with his past ecclesiastical history, the remarks of one worthy gentleman in particular, who figured along with Dr. Breckenridge in the rending of the Presbyterian Church thirty years ago, must be felt to carry with them a special interest. "The Rev. Dr. Musgrave," we are told, "who was well-known as prominent on the Old School side at the time of the division, said this was not the first Convention which he had attended, as he was a member of the Convention of 1837. He spoke often, and earnestly and eloquently in favor of a speedy union. He said he believed that the Convention was as competent now to settle this question practically as it will be in five or ten years hence. He could not see why the whole Church cannot be united, as we all profess to believe in the same thing, and agree as to government. If the Committee present us a sound basis for union, such as will secure a united and Permanent Church, I will be in favor of it. I believe we are all prepared for it. [Applause.] The speaker said he had never felt so happy in his life as during the sessions of the Convention. He would thank God if the Committee would bring us a sound basis on

which we could unite. Such would be its moral influence, that all the Churches would be led to adopt it. He was not so sanguine that every individual would believe in such an organic basis of the union. They might stand out together in the cold for a time; but they would soon be glad to come in, and we would be as glad to receive them. We will keep the doors open. [Applause.] If they do stay out, they will do it on their own responsibility."

The report of the Committee on the Basis of Union, was presented on Thursday afternoon, and became then, of course, the proper subject of business for the Convention, during the remainder of its sessions. On the day following, however, there was an interruption of the regular business (a sort of wheel within wheel), which threatened, for a time, in the way of episode, to absorb the interest of the main action in its own superior enthusiasm. This was the memorable feat of fraternization, which was enacted between this Presbyterian Convention, and a certain other Episcopal Convention that happened to be holding its sessions in Philadelphia at the same time; altogether, a most dramatic scene, in which the interest of the whole occasion was wrought to its highest pitch, and all were made to feel that Friday was, of a truth, not only "the last day, but also the great day of the feast."

What led to this, was the friendly advance made from the Presbyterian side on Wednesday evening; when, having learned that "a large body of *Evangelical* clergymen and laymen of the Episcopal Church were in session in the city, deliberating on matters affecting the common interests of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," the Union Meeting adopted, unanimously, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this Convention send its cordial salutation to our Episcopal brethren now assembled in Convention in this city, praying that grace, mercy, and peace, may rest upon them from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

A special committee had been appointed to bear the salutation to the Episcopal Convention, which received it so favorably, that, on motion of Mr. Tyng, it was determined to respond

to it personally by another committee; and it was the appearance of this deputation now, in the main aisle of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, with Bishops McIlvaine and Lee at its head, and more than a hundred Episcopal clergymen in its train, which became at once the signal for the grand outburst of brotherly love that followed, exceeding in theatrical effect all that was ever exhibited of the sort, on May platforms or anywhere else, in the history of the country before.

The Convention rose to receive its guests. Then there was prayer, led by the Rev. Dr. Newton, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia. Then the whole congregation, standing, rang out the lines:

> Behold how good a thing it is,
> And how becoming well,
> Together such as brethren are
> In unity to dwell!

This done, the deputation, having ascended the platform, were formally introduced to the house by the Rev. Dr. H. B. Smith, of New York, Chairman of the Presbyterian committee of salutation; whereupon the President of the Convention, Mr. G. H. Stuart, advancing to Bishop McIlvaine, said: "*Brother*—I shall not call you *Bishop* now, for we are brothers in Christ Jesus. I, on behalf of the Presbyterian Convention, welcome you and your colleagues." The Bishop replied, that he was glad to find his old friend, Mr. Stuart, presiding over this august body; and then, stepping to the front of the platform, addressed the Convention as follows:

"Dearly beloved brethren! We reciprocate your prayers on our behalf. Those prayers have been answered, not directly, but more auspiciously than most of us could have anticipated. God has answered them in the spirit of love. The entrance of your deputation was a grateful surprise, and every heart was opened at once. We are here to-day for the purpose of expressing our love and our desires in response. It may seem to you a remarkable indication of Providence when I tell you, that when the Episcopal General Convention was assembled in this city in 1856, the matter of promoting co-operation with other

Churches [in measures for the bringing about a better understanding was brought before the House of Bishops. A committee of five was appointed to take advantage of any opportunity that God in His providence might devise in promoting a nearer union. It is remarkable that I am the only surviving member of that committee. The rest have all gone to the blessed union above. I am rejoiced to think it is reserved for me to stand in this place to discharge the duty which I believe to be of the sort contemplated by the House of Bishops. The right hand of fellowship was extended to us yesterday in prayer, and now in this manner. I greet you in the name of the House of Bishops, and I greet you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. [Applause.] These are times when, instead of there being a desire to magnify our differences, we should aim to bring about such measures as will unite us in the advancement of the Church of Christ. The foundation which the Church builds upon is a sure one, and we stand here to testify to our common standing upon that foundation. Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ. Let us be careful, however, how we build thereon. We live in a most solemn age of the world, and we have serious evils to face; we have to war against infidelity; we have to war against the power which has stood against the Church—a power which at this day has its eyes upon this country and that on the other side of the water. It becomes us, therefore, to unite our endeavors to further every right effort to advance the truth. May God bless us in our endeavors in this great work.

"The President, then taking Bishop Lee by the hand, introduced him to the Convention, saying: The last time that Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Lee, and I met, we were at the gates of Richmond, asking Jefferson Davis to allow us to enter Richmond and minister to the starving Union soldiers who had been battling for our beloved country. Now that we have one united country, may we not hope that soon we will have one united Church?

"Bishop Lee said the deputation had come to reciprocate the courteous and Christian greeting that had been extended to

their body. He felt, in common with the one who had preceded him, that this interchange of fellowship and Christian love was unprecedented and unexpected. This certainly cannot be attributed to the will or wisdom of man, but to God our Father. As the deputation entered this house the first words that greeted their ears were those uttered in the prayer that was offered, 'Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father: to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' We come to acknowledge each other as belonging to this royal priesthood. He felt that it was a privilege to be permitted here to speak of the feelings of love which we entertain for all the family of Christ. He expressed his sympathy with the members of this Convention as members of the household of faith, and as engaged in the same great and blessed work, and we all wish that mutual sympathy may prevail among us. We call to remembrance that the truths of the Reformation have been maintained by your communion. We rejoice that you are preparing to stand unitedly against the powers of darkness. In that great day, when we shall be assembled before the throne of God, how insignificant will appear the differences which have here distracted us as members of the Church. He concluded by thanking the Convention for the warm and fraternal reception which had been given to him and his colleagues.

"Prof. Smith then led in reciting the Apostles' Creed—all present repeating—after which the hymn,

'Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love,'

was sung by the entire assembly with deep emotion.

"Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., and Messrs. Conyngham and Brunot, made brief addresses, when Mr. Stuart replied: Right Reverend Fathers, and dearly beloved brethren, we thank you, in the name of this Convention, for the words of cordial greeting and Christian sympathy which you have been permitted, as the representatives of one of the great religious bodies of this country, to express. Your trials are ours. We have the same battles to fight, we have the same doctrines of Jesus Christ to

proclaim to the world, and we rejoice that there are fields in which we can work together. He then alluded to the scenes in which he had labored, in connection with Bishop McIlvaine, in behalf of dying men on the battle field, and in hospitals, and wherever dying men could be found. He did not believe, that this honored father was ever engaged in more truly apostolic work than when, as he once saw him, he was preaching Christ from the saddle to 1,200 prisoners of war; or when, as he saw him on another occasion, he was kneeling on the bar-room floor of the Planters' Hotel at Fredericksburg by the side of a dying Indian, who had served in the army of the Union, pointing him to a crucified Saviour, and commending his soul in prayer to God. He depicted other scenes deeply affecting to all present.

The President then called upon the Rev. Charles Hodge, of Princeton Theological Seminary, who addressed the deputation as follows:

"I am called upon to speak a word of welcome in behalf of the brethren of the Presbyterian Church, a denomination that is represented by about five thousand ministers, an equal number of churches, and over a million of souls who have been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. I am for the moment the mouth-piece of this body, and allow me to present to you our cordial and affectionate Christian salutation. We wish to assure you, that your names are just as familiar to our people as to your own, and that we appreciate your services in the cause of our common Master, as highly as the people of your own denomination. We rejoice with them in all the good that has been accomplished through your instrumentality. I hope this audience will pardon a reference to what might seem personal under any other circumstances than the present. You, Bishop McIlvaine, and Bishop Johns, whom I had hoped to see on this occasion, and I, were boys together in Princeton College, fifty odd years ago. Evening after evening have we knelt together in prayer. We were baptized in spirit together in the great revival of 1815, in that institution; we sat together year after year in the same class-room, and we were instructed by

the same venerable theological teachers. You have gone your way, and I mine, but I will venture to say, in the presence of this audience, that I do not believe that in all that time you have preached any one sermon, which I would not have rejoiced to have delivered. I feel the same confidence in saying, that I never preached a sermon, which you would not have fully and cordially endorsed. Here we now stand gray-headed, side by side, after more than fifty years, the representatives of these two great bodies, feeling for each other the same intimate and cordial love, looking not backwards, not downwards at the grave at our very feet, but onward to the coming glory. Brethren, pardon these personal allusions, but is there not something that may be regarded as symbolical on this occasion? Sir, were not your Church and ours rocked in the same cradle? Have they not passed through the same Red Sea of trial? Did we not receive the same baptism of the Spirit? Do they not bear the same testimony to Christ and the Apostles? What difference is there between the 39 articles and our Confession, greater than the difference between the different parts of one great cathedral anthem that rises to the skies? Does it not seem to you that these great Churches are coming together? We stand here to declare to the whole world, that we are one in faith, one in baptism, one in hope, and one in allegiance to your Lord and our Lord."

During the delivery of Dr. Hodge's address, tears were falling from almost every eye, and it would be impossible with the pen to convey any adequate impression of the solemnity of the scene.

Rev. Dr. Stearns, of Newark, addressing the delegation, said: "The emotions and impressions of this scene are as strange as they are joyful. We seem now to catch a glimpse of that one United Church, whose beauty the King greatly desireth. It was not from us that the impulse for this interchange of Christian fellowship came. It was from God. Dr. S. referred to the steps which had been taken to unite the two largest of the Presbyterian Churches and subsequently to unite the whole Presbyterian family, and said that in this we did not

dream of hearing such voices from other sources, and of having such sympathy expressed as we have heard on this occasion. We love the Episcopal Church. We love it for her defence of the Faith once delivered to the saints, for her rich and varied Christian literature, and for the names which she has furnished for the noble army of the martyrs. We shall love you more than ever. We are no more strangers and foreigners to each other, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the one household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. He expressed the belief that the day was not far distant when all the Churches of Christ would be found side by side in the great battle for the Truth."

After these addresses, we are told, the assembly spent some moments in silent prayer. Then Bishop McIlvaine led in supplicating God's blessing on this Presbyterian Convention; the Rev. Dr. John Hall, of New York (late of Dublin), followed with like supplication for the Episcopal Church in this country and throughout the world; Bishop Lee offered the Lord's Prayer, the vast assemblage joining; Mr. Stuart, addressing Bishop McIlvaine, repeated the Mosaic blessing, from the closing verses of the sixth chapter of Numbers; the congregation joined in singing the long metre Christian doxology; and finally all was closed with the Apostolic Benediction, solemnly pronounced by Bishop McIlvaine.

Such was the beginning, middle, and end of this highly sensational scene, "in which," says the New York Observer, "every one felt that he had come as near to the communion and spirit of the heavenly world, as it is ever permitted to attain here below."

One can hardly help feeling a certain amount of bathos, in descending from such exaltation to the subsequent work of the Convention, as we find it wholly taken up with settling a Basis of Union for the different sections and segments of the Presbyterian Church. It seems to be a mockery of that nearness to the "communion and spirit of the heavenly world," which had gone before. The work, however, in its way, came to what

was considered to be a triumphant and glorious conclusion. Terms of agreement were settled, and we have them now actually before the world as a *bona fide* Basis of Union, on which all Presbyterian denominations are invited to come together as one Church. The platform embraces four suitably guarded articles, as follows:

"*First*, An acknowledgment of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God and only infallible rule of Faith and Practice.

"*Second*, In the United Church the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be received and adopted as containing the system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scripture, it being understood that this Confession is received in its proper historical, that is, its Calvinistic or Reformed sense.

"Whilst the Committee recommend the foregoing basis of doctrine, they wish to be understood as recognizing the orthodoxy of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort.

"*Third*, The United Church shall receive and adopt the Presbyterian Form of Church Government.

"*Fourth*, The Book of Psalms, which is of divine inspiration, is well adapted to the state of the Church in all ages and circumstances, and should be used in the worship of God. Therefore we recommend that a new and faithful version of the Book of Psalms be provided as soon as practicable. But, in as much as various collections of the Psalmody are used in the different Churches, a change in this respect should not be required."

The Convention, after the parturition of this paper, adjourned late on Friday night, well pleased with its own work. Altogether it was unquestionably a most extraordinary occasion; and it is not strange, that it should be spoken of with enthusiasm afterwards by those, who were made to feel in any way the afflatus of its spirit.

"All who attended the meeting," according to the *New York Observer*, "not only those who came as delegates, but the vast congregation which filled the spacious church day after day

and night after night, felt that God in very deed was there by the power of His Holy Spirit, subduing all hearts and minds, melting them into one, and guiding and controlling the action of this large body of more than three hundred ministers and elders of six branches of the Presbyterian Church. The result to which it came was the more remarkable, inasmuch as when the Convention came together there was no concerted plan of action; no one seemed to know what was to be, or what could be done; but while all hearts were lifted up in prayer for guidance from on high, the answer was given in the spirit of brotherly love and mutual concession and fraternal confidence, which characterized the remarks and proceedings, and in the final result. Many who came to the Convention strongly opposed to the Union of the Churches, regarding it as impracticable and undesirable at present, were convinced that God was in the movement: they expressed themselves as amazed at the divine influence which so evidently pervaded the assembly, and giving up all opposition declared themselves ready for the consummation.

Even the *Presbyterian* falls into a sort of frigid rapture in discoursing of the wonders of the occasion.

"The Convention," it tells us, "was certainly a remarkable body, and has done a remarkable work. It was composed of representative men from the various bodies which sent them up; and of these men, some were among the very foremost men of their respective Churches—conspicuous in their own communions for wisdom, moderation, learning, and attachment to the Churches in which they have ministered or ruled, and ready at all times to defend the principles which they represented. They came together—many of them wondering for what they had been summoned from their homes—some utterly skeptical touching any good results to be reached by these meetings, and others waiting with much curiosity to see what the singular assembly might bring forth. As we looked at them on the evening previous to the regular opening of the Convention, we judged them to be as little likely to be swept away by any gust of enthusiasm, or the soft words of sentimentalism, as any body of men we have

ever chanced to see. Yet it was manifest to any one who watched the Convention, that enthusiasm was its special characteristic, and that the tide of feeling steadily rose from the commencement to the close of its sessions. The most obvious objection, indeed, to the Convention, was that it rapidly changed its character from that of a body calmly and soberly settling the principles upon which a great movement is to be conducted, to that of a mass meeting, manipulated by hands skillful in the management of such enthusiastic gatherings. Men wept, laughed, grasped each other's hands, and disturbed the echoes of the old Covenanter Church with rounds of hearty applause. We heard of one good brother who, in the excess of his joy, shouted, 'Glory, hallelujah,' and did this with genuine Methodist earnestness and emphasis. Those who were not present cannot conceive of the feeling which pervaded the Assembly, and the vast audiences which looked down upon it; and we advise any one who is fond of strong sensations, and was not present, that he has missed the fairest opportunity for indulgence in this kind of excitement, which will be presented to him for many long years." "The prevalent enthusiasm was, of course, greatly intensified by the appearance of the Episcopalians in the Convention. It was with some surprise that the Presbyterians heard that a delegation, with two Bishops at its head, had been appointed to bear the salutations of the Evangelical Episcopalians; but when the body from which this delegation came, marched in, and joined in one of the old Psalms, and then, when the whole company, led by Dr. Richard Newton, joined in prayer to God for the 'precious, elected, justified, and sanctified Church of God,' it was felt by all that we were truly one in Christ Jesus, and that one good Spirit dwelt in all hearts. The services of that morning will surely never be forgotten by any one who was within the walls of that church. The recitation of the Apostles' Creed, as the expression of the unity of all in the one faith of the Church, and the union of all voices in the Lord's Prayer, as the expression of the oneness of all in their wants and desires, were grateful to all hearts; and when Dr. Hodge stepped forth upon the platform, as the representative of the

Presbyterian Church, to greet Bishop McIlvaine, as the representative of his Church, to speak of the years of their boyhood—of their baptism by the Spirit of God—of their years of study at the feet of Dr. Alexander—of the grave, at the margin of which they stood, and of the glowing hopes which lit up the future as they looked beyond the grave, the heart of the great assembly melted, and tears flowed freely from many eyes. It was good to feel, while striving to perfect our Presbyterian unity, that there was a higher unity, in which Christian hearts are bound together by invisible links, and it was with inexpressible joy that great congregation took up the words of the hymn,

'Blest be the tie that binds,'

and sang it with uplifted voices and swelling hearts. The speeches made on the occasion were imbued with the Spirit of Christ, and none could witness the scene without feeling that 'one Lord, one faith, and one baptism,' stand at the foundation of this blessed union of hearts. The effect was, at the time, most happy, and we must hope it will continue to be happy, and the two Churches, although they must still stand apart in their organizations, will be stimulated to 'love as brethren.' "—How much may have been accomplished by the Convention for the union of the Presbyterian Churches, is acknowledged to be not yet entirely clear; but there is room for hope. The immense moral influence of the occasion, we are told, must be all in the line of increased unity of spirit, which will most infallibly work out, in time, a complete organic unity. "Meanwhile (the Presbyterian goes on to say) we think it is well that all the propositions submitted to the Churches by this Convention, are to be considered in Synods and Assemblies, where every word and sentence will be carefully and calmly weighed, and where, we may be sure, the interests of truth and righteousness will be jealously guarded, and the ancient Presbyterian faith and order maintained and re-asserted. How the Basis of Union will pass through the ordeals before it, we cannot presume to foretell; but thousands of hearts will be bitterly disappointed if, out of the movement thus happily inaugurated, there shall not come a

union of the now divided Churches, of the Presbyterian faith, sufficient to establish in this land a National Presbyterian Church, co-extensive in its limits with the nation, and blessing the whole nation by its earnest efforts to build up within its bosom the glorious kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—If, however, this blessed vision is still to tarry, and the dikes which have stood so long, are to stand in the future as hinderances to the general mingling of the waters, the Convention which has just been dissolved, must still be considered as a gathering altogether remarkable and unique, and one well worthy of a place in history. It would be noteworthy if it had been only a meeting of the various branches of the Presbyterian family, gathered together in one, and all finding themselves very much at home. But when the men who belonged to the Church of Cranmer and Hooker came in to mingle with the men of the Church of Calvin and Knox, and the two bodies stood up to repeat the Creed, which has come to us from the early ages of the Church, and bears the Apostles' name, and then lifted up their voices to pray in words taught them by the Redeemer of the world, the scene rose far out of ordinary scenes, and the meeting, with its precious experiences, will be fixed, we believe, in the history of the Church, as one which all true lovers of Christ's Church will not willingly let die. Nor will it be forgotten, we think, in the General Assembly and Church of the first-born."

PART SECOND.

We have thought it well to give a somewhat extended account of this Union Convention; not simply because of its highly interesting character in itself considered, but with the view also of making use of it as an occasion for some practical reflections on the general subject of Church unity, the cause in whose service the meeting was held.

I. All must honor the Convention, as one of the most interesting and significant movements of the time in favor of Christian union.

That the church should be one in some way, may be regarded as one of the first principles of Christianity. It lies, indeed, in the very conception of the Church, as an object of faith, that it should be one, holy, and catholic, according to the Creed; and those who try to conceive of it in any other way, convict themselves, at once, of not being in harmony with this old *regula fidei* in their general view of the Gospel. For the true Christian spirit, then, the existing divisions of the Protestant Church can never fail to be a cause of lamentation and grief.

It will not do to say, that they amount to nothing, as being of outward character only, and not interfering at all with what is called the free unity of the Spirit; and that the unity of Protestantism, therefore, is as little broken really by these denominational distinctions, as is the unity of our nation by its different state governments, or its rival political parties. The two orders of life differ *toto cœlo;* and it is little better than treason to the true idea of the kingdom of heaven, to take the measure of it in such sort from the kingdoms of this world. Even this low way of looking at the subject is constrained at once, indeed, to reach beyond its own stand-point again, and to grasp after the notion of some visible unity, as necessary to eke out the felt insufficiency of its invisible abstraction; so powerful here is the instinct of Christianity, even where most wronged; but it is only so as to take up, after all, with the poor imagination of an external confederacy of sect (far short thus of our National Government), agreeing to work together to a certain extent for common ends. To give visible expression to the actual inward unity of Protestant Christendom in such style, we are told, is the grand and glorious mission of the *Evangelical Alliance;* and with this, it seems to be assumed, our craving for the "communion of saints" may afford to be satisfied, at least, for the present, as we are not likely to have anything better before the millennium.

In the end, however, no such low ecclesiasticism can prove generally satisfactory. Never, certainly, for the deeper religious life of Protestantism. The true Christian spirit yearns after *organic* oneness, as the only proper form of Christ's body,

and cannot be put off with the wretched *succedaneum* of an outward world-alliance, however respectable, pompously paraded in its place.

Of this we have abundant evidence, throughout the Protestant world, at the present time. The miseries of our reigning sect system, staring us in the face as they do from all sides, have come to be universally felt and acknowledged. Men are tired of divisions, which seem in most cases to have outlived their original meaning; which weaken so palpably the strength of the Church; and which tend steadily, as all may see, to its universal disintegration. And now there is at work every where, unmistakably, what may be called a deep reactionary tide of feeling and thought, in all the better part of the Protestant world, toward the ideal of the old Christian Creeds—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism," answering to the Pontifical Prayer: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." All the best theology of the age—whatever there is of theology, indeed, at this time, which is living, and not "twice dead, plucked up by the roots"—looks in this direction, revolves around this problem, "groans and travails in pain," we may say, toward this magnificent end. It is Christological, and, for those, who can understand it, moves throughout in the bosom of the Church Question. There are felt wants, at the same time, in the liturgical life of Protestantism every where, sensibilities of public devotion, that press with strong force in the same general direction. Then we have any amount of platform declamation on the theme of ecclesiastical catholicity and brotherhood, going to show, that the theme is popular, and sure to strike a responsive chord in all religious assemblies. To crown all, we have all sorts of overtures, more particularly of late, toward the outward actualization, in some way, of what is felt to be, in such view, the proper law of the Christian life, and the only true order of the Christian Church. These generally terminate, it is true, in the notion of mere outward leagues, or of very partial amalgamations at the best; but they are none the less worthy

of attention for this, as testimonies in favor of Christian union; while the interest with which they are received is, at the same time, specially significant, as showing how deep-seated and wide-spread the feeling is, that our religious divisions are wrong, and sadly at war with the true Spirit of Christ.

Among all movements of this sort, now, the Presbyterian Union Convention, held lately in Philadelphia, is entitled to special consideration. It may be regarded, indeed, as the most extraordinary demonstration in favor of Protestant Church unity, which has occurred in our time. It challenges pious admiration, through its spontaneous, apparently self-impelling character; starting as it did from so small a religious body (and out of the large soul, probably, of a single layman, Mr. George H. Stuart); coming before the world with so little observation; and yet meeting such favorable response, and gathering into itself, at last, such an amount of respectability and force as we find to have been comprehended in it in fact. Then the meeting seemed to go beyond itself again in the whole scope of its proceedings; as though it had been apprehended by a spirit greater than its own, which it must afterward try to apprehend as the great object of its coming together. Speaking in behalf of the Old School delegation generally, Dr. Hodge is quoted as saying: "We thought it probable that some plan of federal union, which would allow each member of the confederation to retain its own peculiarities, and to revolve in its own sphere, might be proposed and recommended. But we did not expect that any plan of organic union, embracing all the Presbyterian Churches in our land, would be for a moment thought of." From the first hour of their coming together, however, with the solitary exception of what was spoken by Dr. Breckinridge, every speech and prayer had looked to this end only, as though the Convention had met for no other purpose. "Such being the case," he adds, "I have taken no part in your deliberations, but have sat in silence, waiting to see what God, by His providence and Spirit, would bring to pass." It really seemed as if God had taken the meeting into His own hands, and made it to mean more than any of those concerned in it had originally designed.

Most of all might this appear to have been the case, in the coming in of that strange interlude, which took place on the last day of the meeting, when the Episcopal delegation made its appearance in the crowded Covenanter Church; a scene which was, in the fullest sense, providential, and for which no place, of course, was by any one so much as dreamed of in the programme of the occasion previously. Not only, indeed, did this scene go beyond the original purpose of the Convention; it was felt, for the time, fairly to overshadow it, causing the joyful hope of Presbyterian unity, for the moment, to forget itself in the far more glorious vision of that catholic Christian unity, which the two Churches, Presbyterian and Episcopalian, were drawn to anticipate delightfully in the common recitation of the Apostles' Creed. And it is not to be wondered at, then, if on coming down from that mount of evanescent transfiguration, the Presbyterian disciples, left again to themselves, may have found it, as we have intimated before, a somewhat tame business, to go on settling afterwards the terms of their own much narrower fellowship on the basis of the Westminster Confession. Was there something providential also in this? Was it intended to work as a sacred irony upon the catholic spirit of the Convention, by forcing upon it the glimpse of a still higher catholicity, in whose presence its own became relatively poor and mean?

However that may be, we have no hesitation in allowing the Convention to have been worthy of all admiration and praise. It met for a noble object; was composed of honorable and good men; breathed throughout a most excellent spirit; and did, in its way, true service to the cause of Christianity, which deserves thankful remembrance. This is our first and most immediate reflection on the occasion. We consider it highly important as a protest against the divisions of Presbyterianism, and, in spite of itself, a protest also against the divisions of Protestantism generally; and honor it as one of the most striking testimonies of the time to the necessity, not simply of union among Christians in the low Christian alliance sense, but of organic, catholic unity, in the old sense of the Apostles' Creed, as that without which the true idea of the Church never can be complete.

II. But we find a second reflection forced home upon us, by this Presbyterian congress, which is of a less pleasing and cheering character; a reflection which goes far, in fact, to make us think of it only with sadness, as being in itself one of the most sorrowful exemplifications of the misery of our prevailing sect system, as well as of its helpless, hopeless insufficiency for working out successfully its own cure. We see in the movement strikingly, how radically wrong and absurd our denominational divisions are in their nature, and how fatally in themselves, at the same time, they defy all attempts to bring them back to Church unity. The very law of their existence is divisive. They are constitutionally unchurchly, and under the ban, thus, of perpetual separation.

What more painful evidence could we have of the evil that is comprehended in our sect system, than the fact that there are so many branches of the Presbyterian Church among us, and that it has been felt necessary for a Convention to come together in this way, after so long a time, for the purpose of considering, solemnly and carefully, the possibility of their being joined together as a single Church?

There are distinctions in the history of Christianity, which have a deep principle, and in this way a certain justification, in the wholeness of the Christian life itself. Such was the difference between Jewish and Gentile Christianity in the beginning of the Gospel; such, in some measure, the difference between the Greek Church and the Latin; such the positive faith of Protestantism over against that of Romanism; and such, finally, the original divergency of the two great root Confessions of Protestantism itself in the sixteenth century, which have their proper title still as Lutheran and Reformed. Even these cases of principial division, as it may be called, in which different sides of one and the same organic totality find a certain amount of legitimate expression, are required to come together in the deeper unity of Christ; who is our peace, says St. Paul; the profoundest and most comprehensive sense of our human life; the reconciliation and harmony of all its otherwise necessary antagonisms, where there is neither circumcision nor un-

circumcision, Jew, nor Greek, nor Scythian, male nor female, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all. No such relative justification, however, can possibly apply to the divisions of the Presbyterian Church. We will say nothing of the right of Presbyterianism itself, in its general Scotch form, to narrow the conception of the Reformed Church to its own provincial phase of church discipline and faith; but what *organic* reason can any sound Christian mind possibly pretend to see, in the subsequent divisions of this Scotch Church in Scotland, down to the present time, or, still worse if possible, in the continuance of these divisions, and the origination of new ones, here in America? How many separate Presbyterian bodies (of the Scotch order) there are now in this country, we will not venture to say positively. Eight or ten, certainly—they may amount now, for all we know, to as many as twelve or fifteen. And all these stand not only on the common platform of the Bible, but also on the basis of a common separate phase of the Reformed faith, as we have it drawn out at large in the Westminster Confession! Then they are not ignorant and fanatical sects. They represent, largely, the intelligence, learning, and piety of the land. Yet there they are, holding on to their separate platforms as if the life of the world depended on it; when yet, in fact, it is not too much to say, that neither they themselves, nor the world, have any clear idea whatever of what their several platforms actually mean. We, at all events, have always found it a perfect bore to keep in our mind the run of these Scotch and Scotch-American Presbyterian denominations, with anything like ecclesiastical accuracy, or theological precision. The truth is, there is neither sense nor religion in the subject. It is bewildering confusion from beginning to end.

It is a sad commentary, thus, on the unchurchly character of our Christianity, which the divisions of the Presbyterian Church bring into view; and we cannot help regarding it as a melancholy spectacle, when we find the work of Christian Union, in the case of this Philadelphia Convention, compelled as it were to start with so poor a business as the bringing together in the first place simply of the religious bodies that agree already in

being Presbyterians sworn to the Westminster Confession. It is humiliating to the last degree, that there should be any occasion to begin in this poor way; that divisions so little principial and rational, should not have healed themselves long ago spontaneously; that the subject of their reconciliation should need to be approached with so much caution and trembling apprehension; that so much account should be made of even the remote prospect of their being brought to an end on the basis of union here laboriously produced, as the result of three days' prayerful consultation for the purpose. What an irony, the world may well exclaim, was not the whole work of this Presbyterian Convention in such view, on the cause of Protestant catholicity generally? If it be so hard a business to bring together the broken ranks of a single wing of this vast scattered army, where it would seem to be most of all easy to do so, what must be thought of the prospect for rallying the army at large around any common standard, or into any common organization?

No wonder that these Presbyterian divisions are a matter of perplexing amazement to foreign Churches. "Some two months ago," says Dr. Thomas Guthrie of Edinburgh in his letter read at the Convention, "I attended the sittings of the Evangelical Alliance at Amsterdam. Would that all good men in your country, and in mine, saw things with the eyes of the distinguished representatives of the foreign Evangelical Churches whom I met there! With what astonishment did they hear of any opposition to the proposed union of our Presbyterian Churches! How little, in the eyes of these distinguished men, these impartial and unprejudiced judges, seemed the points on which the opponents of union stood!" Only think of the grand confessional and theological issues of the sixteenth century being made to bend to the question of singing Rouse's Psalms!

But if it be humbling to think of the occasion for such a meeting, it is more humiliating still to find it coming to such small positive result for the accomplishment of its own object. There was much fine talk in the Convention, and much fine

feeling. It was good, all felt, to be there. We wish not to disparage in any way the earnestness of its zeal or the wisdom of its counsels. It did the best it could do, probably, in the circumstances. But this only makes the matter worse. That such a body, convened for such an object, and so borne aloft on what was felt to be the more than human inspiration of the occasion, should after all have been able to bring to pass no more than the tautological basis of union in which all its labors ended, is just what sets the impotence of such a conclusion in its most glaring light. For what better is it than the poorest tautology in fact to say, "Let us come together as Presbyterians on the basis of the Bible and the Westminster Confession;" when that is the very ground on which, as Presbyterians, they have been professedly standing, every sect of them, all along? One can hardly help smiling indeed, to see the account that has been made of this wonderful *form of concord*, as though it were to be a full panacea for the wounds of Joseph, and a talisman that should cause to cease forever the mutual vexings of Ephraim and Judah; while it is not difficult, however, to discern through all, at the same time, an undertone of calculating doubt, that serves to qualify very materially the enthusiasm of so pleasing a thought. Dr. Hodge after waiting in silence "to see what God, by His providence and Spirit, would bring to pass," seems impressed at last with the sense of a direct interposition of heaven in the plan submitted for uniting the Churches. "When the committee appointed to bring in a basis for the organic union of all these Churches," he says, "reported a unanimous agreement, I was greatly surprised; there was nothing in the report, as it seemed to me, to which any old school man could object. The ground of union proposed, was that on which we as a Church had always stood." Of course, it was; and no doubt the other delegations were no less astonished, to find that they too, after waiting to see what would come to pass, were allowed by the proposed union to stand just where they had been standing all along before. The only marvel is that it should have been felt necessary, in so plain a case, to go on afterwards debating and discussing such

terms of consolidation, as if any thing could come out of the discussion more than the self-evident truism with which it started. A grand thing, truly, for a congress of Westminsterian Churches to tell the world, and one another, that they acknowledge the Scriptures to be God's Word, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; that they subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith; that they hold to the Presbyterian form of Church Government; that they consider the Book of Psalms proper to be used in the worship of God; and that they see no good reason, therefore, why they, and all Presbyterian bodies, should not form themselves into a grand United Church now on this basis. All the world knew the whole of that before. Was it necessary to have it theatrically proclaimed again through this National Presbyterian Convention? And now that the Convention has done and said all it could, in the circumstances, is there any reason at all to expect, that the dream of One, Holy, Catholic Presbyterian Church is ever likely to be realized as the fruit of its labors?

We fear not. Our faith may be weak, our enthusiasm poor; but so it is, we have no power to take in any such joyous prospect. We cannot help thinking that Dr. Breckinridge was more than half right, in trying to throw cold water on the idea of organic union at the beginning of the meeting; though it was well, perhaps, that he was stopped off at the time, and was hindered by sickness from having any thing to do with the business of the body afterwards. It would carry us too far to give in detail our reasons for believing that little or nothing will come of this movement. Enough that we can easily feel a measure of distrust in it, running through the proceedings of the Convention itself. Enough that it is allowed to be only the beginning of a long series of complicated negotiations among the bodies invited to come into it, which are sure to be met with endless practical difficulties not yet touched. Enough, that all past experience is against its having any chance of success. The rule with such attempts at amalgamation heretofore, has been in general, that two bodies have become three, rather than one. It is becoming only too plain, we think, that even the Old and New School Presbyterian Churches, after all the

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

talk there has been on the subject, are not likely soon to be reunited. But without this, what shadow of ground can there be to look for any such union among the Presbyterian Churches of the country generally? As the Philadelphia *Basis* means nothing, so it is almost certain finally to issue in nothing, according to the old adage *ex nihilo nihil fit.*

III. This is melancholy; but not altogether so much so as on first view it might seem. We would be glad to see the different branches of Presbyterianism united into one Church. It is a reproach to our Christianity that they cannot be thus brought together, all holding the Bible as they do for their only rule of faith, and all standing alike on the Westminster Confession as their common platform of doctrine; and the fact is as painful a commentary certainly as we could well have, on the helpless misery of our sect system generally. But so far as the cause of true catholic unity is concerned, the great Christian thought that underlies all these calls for Church union, we cannot see that this Presbyterian movement means much, or that its full success would be of any very great account. Its highest object after all has not been catholic unity in any true sense, as this is made to be a point of faith in the Apostles' Creed, but only denominational unity in the case of a particular sect; which, however large and respectable, can by no possibility represent the proper wholeness of the Church.

We may be told, indeed, that the work of general Church union must begin with particular confessional unions; and that when the several Christian denominations are first fully united in themselves, the way will then be open for aiming at the higher object of forming them all at last into one Church. Some fancy of this sort seems in fact to have been more or less in the mind of the Union Convention in Dr. Wylie's Church, while busily engaged with its dream of catholic Presbyterianism. Through that dream there was the dim, but still warmly glowing vision all along of a higher catholicity lying beyond, to which it was hoped that first step might ultimately lead. We have seen how powerfully this feeling prevailed, especially in the scene with the Episcopalians. "The heart of the great assembly melted," we are told, "and tears flowed freely from

many eyes. It was good to feel, while striving to perfect our Presbyterian unity, that there was a higher unity, in which Christian hearts are bound together by invisible links; and it was with inexpressible joy that great congregation took up the words of the hymn, *Blest be the tie that binds*, and sang it with uplifted voices and swelling hearts." All very beautiful and affecting. But all, we must reiterate, going only to stultify the whole business of that Presbyterian Council, which was assembled there for the purpose solely of consolidating a powerful exclusivism, on the basis of a very narrow and partial confession, that should stand then as a high tower of defence and opposition over against the whole idea of Christian catholicity under any broader view. Can we believe that there was any real affinity between such sectarianism and those deep yearnings after "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," which we find forcing themselves into view so remarkably through the whole occasion, and giving to it in fact its main interest? We, for our part, believe nothing of the sort. The yearnings were there as pent up fires, in spite of the sectarian restraint. There was no real approximation whatever in the sectarianism itself, as such, to the true idea of Church unity; and it will be found a vain imagination forever, we are fully persuaded, to think of coming to such union ultimately through any such process of preliminary sect unions. Sectarianism is by its very conception the opposite of catholicity, and it can never be made to promote of itself the consummation of our Lord's last prayer: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee!" If the sense of that prayer is ever to be actualized among our lamentable Protestant divisions, it must be through some other order of thought, some wholly different form of Church sentiment and Church life.

If ever the Apostolic idea of Church unity is to be restored practically among our denominations, it must work itself into felt force first as an idea starting from itself, and not as a generalization merely derived from these sects. There must be awakened and quickened among us, in some way, a sense for the proper wholeness of the Church, that shall go before, and

not simply come after our sense for the Christianity of our several sects. Full earnest must be made with the article of the Creed: "*I believe* in the Holy Catholic Church." This need not imply indifference to our denominational confessions, as they now stand; but it must require the subjection of our interest in these particular confessions to our interest in the wholeness of the Christian faith and life, as something more than an abstraction; as itself the power of a confession deeper and more comprehensive than all denominational confessions, the necessary beginning thus of the Christian faith, on the basis of which, then, all such particular confessions must stand, to be entitled to any confidence or regard whatever. Where there is a due sense of this necessary relation of the partial to the whole, the different Christian confessions may assert their differences without wrong or damage to the whole; their polemics become in fact irenics, antithesis with a view to ultimate synthesis; and it is easy to see how, in that case, such union movements as we are here considering, though meant primarily only for a single denomination, might yet look, and actually work, also, toward the unity of the Church in a broader and wider view. But can this be considered the character, really, of what is proposed in the Presbyterian movement now before us? We fear not. It is, on the contrary, we think, such an assertion of denominational particularism, as neither seeks nor tends toward true catholicity in any way; and for this reason, if for no other, its failure or success is not a matter that need concern much those who care for the unity of the Church as a whole, and not simply for the unity of the Presbyterian Church as a sect.

All confessionalism, all denominational symbolism, to be of a truly catholic, and not merely sectarian character, must refer itself ultimately to the Apostles' Creed, as the primary basis of the universal Christian faith. So much we feel at liberty to assume here as a first truth in historical theology. Deny the necessity of starting with the Creed, the necessity of being rooted and grounded in the first principles of Christianity, as we have them set forth in this archetypal symbol, and all religious thinking is at sea. So the Church has witnessed through all ages.

Protestantism, by its own original confession, has no right to exist except in the bosom of the Creed. And so, then, its divergent types or schemes of confessional belief, also, as far as they can be considered to have any historical justification, any true organic position (in distinction from mere upstart sects) in ts general movement, must continue organically bound to the same root. Sundered from this, their symbolism can deserve no respect. Here Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, and New England Puritanism, are required to meet on common ground, back of their other platforms of faith; and these platforms must plant themselves on this common ground to carry with them any legitimate force as separate confessions. Without this they cease to be historical, and lose all harmonious relation to the proper unity and wholeness of the Church. All true catholicity, unquestionably, must begin with the cordial, *ex animo* acknowledgment of the Apostles' Creed.

Is it not now, however, something very significant that the schemes of Christian union, of which we hear so much in our time, all seem to take it for granted, that if it is to be reached at all, or to be of any account when reached, it must be based on other articles and terms of agreement than those contained in the Creed—this old, fundamental symbol being either ignored entirely in the case, or, at best, acknowledged only in a secondary and outside way? Congregational Churches have their terms of particular church fellowship in this way, their "Covenants," as they are sometimes called, to which all must subscribe who come into their communion. But who ever heard of one of them making use of the Apostles' Creed for this purpose? Some years ago some New England Missionaries undertook to manufacture a system of Evangelical faith for the new Protestant Armenian Church they had organized in Constantinople. There was no recognition in it whatever of the Creed. So, it will be remembered, the great religious World Convention in London, some twenty years ago, in undertaking to construct an œcumenical platform for the union of all *evangelical* sects, found it necessary to omit all mention of the Creed, and devised a new set of articles altogether as better suited for the purpose;

and the same course has been pursued by every Evangelical Alliance meeting we have had since. The Creed of Universal Christendom has been counted too poor a bond for holding together these Protestant Unions, and they have been fain always to proclaim the strength of their common Christianity in some different way. And thus it is with our union religious associations and movements generally. They abound in sentimental declamation, and please themselves with the notion of a Christianity that is common to all sects. But their catholicity, base itself where it may, is sure never to fall back on the Apostles' Creed.

We are sorry to say, now, that the late Presbyterian Union Convention formed no exception to this bad rule; and that fact is enough of itself to destroy confidence in its work. It is easy to see, at once, that a basis of Christian union which is not itself based upon the Creed, can be of no account—must, indeed, be worse than of no account—for the cause of catholic unity properly so called. But we may go farther and say, that Presbyterianism itself can never be united with any vigorous church life on any such baseless basis. Presbyterian Christianity without the Creed, will prove as little able to stand in the end, whether united or divided, as Christianity without the Creed under any other form.

But was not the Apostles' Creed duly honored and magnified on this occasion, when that stirring scene went forward on Friday morning, in which Presbyterians and Episcopalians, led off by Prof. H. B. Smith, joined with one voice in solemnly repeating the œcumenical symbol, as the expression of their common faith? It is pleasant, certainly, to hear what was thus done in honor of the Creed. It reads well; and it is curious to see how the thing has been held up for rhetorical effect, even in quarters where all real sympathy with the genuine sense of the Creed is notoriously wanting. The truth is, it was an involuntary homage to catholicity, which was forced upon the assembly by what might be called the objective spirit of the occasion; a power that, for the moment, carried the Convention beyond

itself, and lifted it out of its own sphere; as all inspiration, indeed, causes men to speak, or it may be sing, with new tongues.

In this view the fact is highly interesting, as showing how near in reality, for our deepest religious consciousness, the Creed lies to the foundations of all true Christian faith; but farther than this it cannot be taken as of much significance or account. It was a flash of enthusiasm that came and went with its occasion, without leaving behind it any practical result in the actual working of the Convention.

It may be questioned, indeed, whether even this public acknowledgment of the Creed amounted, in the circumstances, to as much as it might appear to mean at first view. We call to mind other occasions of late, on which the same thing has been done in religious meetings, as one evidence of their Christian union; where it was plain enough, however, that it was done for mere stage effect, and without any general hearty acceptance of the symbol whatever. It is an easy thing for our different sects to fall in with the recitation of the Creed, if they are allowed to put into it severally their own meaning. But in this case, the recitation becomes, of course, an empty, if not absolutely hypocritical compliment. And that it must be so with our sects generally at this time, is placed beyond all doubt by the known fact that they make no use of the Creed in their ordinary religion, but have, on the contrary, a certain feeling of strangeness toward it wherever it comes in their way. New England Puritanism, by its own confession, has lost the sense of all harmony with the Creed, honoring it, at best, as a dead "fossil relic," simply, of "by-gone times;" and our sects commonly, there is no doubt, regard it quietly in the same way. Nor is the feeling one of mere indifference; it amounts to positive aversion. For after all that may be said of its loose and vague meaning, making it easy for all to mouth it, in a sense to suit themselves, it is certain not only that the symbol has a determinate historical sense of its own, but also that this, its only proper sense, is so wrought into its whole structure, that it cannot fairly be got out of it except by breaking it to pieces; and it is always the instinctive consciousness of opposition to

what is felt to be thus the true life and spirit of the Creed, therefore, that makes it unpalatable to the Christian sects with whom it has fallen into neglect. They do not use the Creed simply because they do not like it, are in no sympathy with it, feel it to be, at bottom, a witness against them, and not for them. Only so can we account for the strange fact, that these sects should own the fundamental authority of the old formulary, and yet allow it no place, practically, in their families, or in their schools, or in their churches. Where their difficulty with it really lies, may, at the same time, be easily understood. They are unhistorical, therefore unchurchly, and for this reason, again, unsacramental; whereas the Creed is historical, makes the Church an object of faith, and throws a sacramental character round the mystery of godliness throughout; all so effectually, that its whole theory of Christianity is felt, by these sects themselves, to be different from the scheme in which they stand. And hence it is that they feel toward it always very much as Ahab felt in another case of old, when he said to Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah: "There is yet one man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." Exactly so; the Apostles' Creed is a perpetual prophecy of evil against our modern evangelical sects; and therefore they will not allow its voice to be heard in their teaching or worship. If they did, it would soon bring their whole craft into danger of being set at nought. This is the secret of their dislike to it.

We see at once what a farce itmust be, when such utterly unhistorical religions may pretend, at times, to recite the Creed, in token of their own unanimity, and as an argument of their general agreement with the faith of past Christian ages. It is all hollow mummery of the worst sort. In the case of the Presbyterian Convention now before us, we would hope there was something better than this. But it is hard to believe, that the use of the Creed on that occasion amounted to a full *ex animo* assent and consent to all its articles in their true historical sense. We know it ought to have done so; for both

Churches, the Presbyterian no less than the Episcopalian, are bound by their denominational confessions to own the symbolical authority of the old *regula fidei*, as we have it handed down to us in this formulary; and to be owned at all honestly as being of such force, it must be owned as being so in the character of a rule fundamental to all other confessional rules—and so here, of course, a rule fundamental and anterior in particular to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession of Faith. Such being the case, it should be an easy thing for Presbyterians and Episcopalians to join, at any time, as they did in Dr. Wylie's Church, in repeating the Apostles' Creed. But, somehow, we cannot help feeling that it is a great matter to say the Creed *ex animo*. The feeling grows upon us, too, the more we look into the subject; and we cannot avoid asking: Did these different divisions of the Presbyterian camp (to say nothing now of their Low Church Episcopalian guests), know fully, and mean really, what they were outwardly doing, when they thus fell back with common confession on the original faith of the universal Christian world? We will not now press the question any farther. But we must say that if they did do so, we despair of being able to understand at all how it is, that there should be no use of the Creed, so far as we know, in the ordinary worship of Presbyterian churches of every sort at other times, beyond and outside of this grand "act and testimony" in Philadelphia; and how it is, also, that the same act and testimony was not able to secure a place for itself in the *Basis of Union*, which it was the great object of the meeting to establish for the consolidation of Presbyterianism into a single Church.

A basis of faith for such purpose, in which you have the Westminster Confession, with some recognition even of the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Articles of Dordrecht, and yet no mention of the Apostles' Creed (the first and most fundamental of all symbols), any more than if it had never been heard of, or had never had anything to do with Presbyterianism whatever! Is it not ominously strange? Even as a mere oversight, it would tell powerfully against the reigning animus of the occasion. For, how could the Creed be forgotten, where all was

suited to call it to mind, if there had been there any hearty sympathy with the Creed, any full confidence in the Creed, But we know that its omission in the basis of union was no mere oversight. It was made to figure too prominently in the fraternizing scene with the Episcopalians, to admit any thought of that sort; and no doubt there were those in the Convention, who would have been glad if the catholic chord then struck could have furnished the key-note for the confessional work of the body afterwards. But it was soon, alas, lost again in the skies. Another noticeable reminder of what was due here to the occasion, we have in a paper offered to the meeting by the Rev. Dr. Beattie, of Steubenville, Ohio, in which, among other propositions submitted for consideration as terms of church fellowship, we find the following explicit acknowledgement of the authority of the Creed, as coming confessionally *before* all later symbols: "We affirm our belief in that summary of Christian doctrine which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, which we receive as setting forth, in brief, most important doctrines of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." This itself carries in it, we can easily feel, a somewhat poor and cold sound. It lacks the tone of full catholic sympathy with what the Creed is in its own place. But, as it was, it proved too high for the low church temperature of the Convention; never getting so far, indeed as to be even noticed by the Committee which reported the basis of union. We are thus shut up painfully to the conclusion that in framing a platform of faith for the union of the different Presbyterian bodies in the United States, this Philadelphia Convention, with all its catholic sensibilities, did not dare to believe that these bodies could be brought to unite in the common adoption of the Apostles' Creed, as the only true and right beginning of all sound Christian belief and profession; and so, deliberately and of purpose, the Apostles' Creed was excluded from the platform altogether! Such we feel to be the meaning of the whole case. We can make of it nothing more nor less than this.

The conclusion to which we are thus brought, speaks for itself. The occasion we have been reviewing is of no signifi-

cance, we believe, for the interests of Presbyterianism itself. There can be no solidly United Church, even in that partial form, that shall refuse to plant itself, confessionally, on the original Christian Creeds, as all our evangelical Protestantism professed to do in the beginning. Of still less account then can any such movement prove to be for the interests of Christianity at large, or for the actualization of any such millenial vision of Catholic unity as seems to have floated at times before the mind of this venerable and highly respectable Church Council. If anything in the world is certain, we think it is, that no such Catholic unity, whether in theology, or in worship, or in Church life, can ever be reached except on the basis of the old Creeds, taken in their old, only true historical sense; and that the first, and most necessary of all conditions, therefore, for any effectual movement toward this end, is the resuscitation of interest in these Creeds; while all that works the opposite way in our modern religious life, tends wholly and inevitably toward disintegration only, and ultimate chaos.

Art. VI.—CHRISTIAN NURTURE.

The fact of the total and universal depravity of our race is clearly set forth in the Bible and confirmed by all experience. The confession of David, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," and the declaration of God that the "imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," may be justly applied to every human being. And this is in virtue of our relation to our first parent. As descended from him by natural generation we are not only like him in outward form and inward spirit but we participate with him truly and properly in his very nature. We are as much the partakers of his sinful nature as we are of his blood. The whole human family was originally contained potentially in the loins of Adam, and all who have sprung from him are necessa-

rily tainted with his impurity. Human origin is a guarantee of vileness, for it is a law of God's universe, that, that which is clean cannot come from that which is unclean. Accordingly it is written, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners," and "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation."

From this general imputation or charge of sin even infants are not exempt. One of the strongest practical proofs of this is found in the fact that they are liable to suffering and death before they arrive at the age of accountability, because suffering and death can only come as a consequence of sin. "For," says the apostle, "by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The most that men generally have claimed for a child in its natural state, is, that it has not been guilty of actual and wilful transgression, and may therefore be regarded as being in a state of innocence. But *innocence* itself we must remember is only a negative quality, while positive holiness is required by God, and even those that die in infancy have the righteousness of Christ made over to them by the Holy Ghost, and thus appear in that "holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."

But the bare fact that every one of all the myriads who have survived infancy has given evidence of sinfulness, is an overwhelming testimony to the fact that the general proclivity of our nature is towards sin. And even if no traces of sin could be detected in the child, that would be no positive evidence against its natural depravity. There are certain colors that are not at first visible to the eye, and yet in the course of time and by exposure to light and heat, they will according to a chemical law intrinsic to themselves become apparent to all. And just so the sin which we might not be able to detect at first, will in the course of time according to the law of our depraved nature and upon the least occasion, show itself beyond all doubt. But this tendency to sin, we insist upon it, is often exhibited even in the child long before the dawn of consciousness. It is betrayed in the anger and passion which the child

exhibits at its mother's breast, and we must therefore conclude that the manifestation of sin is nothing more than an outward expression of its inmost nature. It is a sinner constitutionally, and the uninterrupted development of its own nature will necessarily be a growth in sin.

From all of this it is evident that what is required for the salvation of our children, is not a mere drawing out of what is already in them, but the instillation of something new and counteracting. This is the difference between the terms 'educate' and 'nurture.' "The word 'educate' simply designates a drawing out of what is already at hand, and this term is never used in the Scriptures, because as just intimated, we are not to become what we ought to be by a mere development of what is already in us. The idea of Christian nurture set forth so frequently in the Bible, underlies this and implies more than this." It involves the fact that something higher and better is to be supplied from without—that life and grace and power have been brought into the service of our humanity in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord, and are to be made over to us by the operation of the Holy Ghost. "Education may be a training and trimming of the branches, while nurture is a feeding of the roots. In the language of another "Nurture is to the child what the warmth, the moisture and the fat of the earth are to the roots of the infant plant; what the light and love of the mother's eye, the warmth and nourishment of the mother's breast are to the unconscious babe, which is there and there gladly, but knows not and cares not why. According to the true sense of nurture children are to be nourished *in* the Lord and not educated *into* Him." Hence we have such commands as these, "Children obey your parents *in the* Lord: for this is right." "And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up *in the nurture* and admonition of the Lord." But now how are children to be incorporated into Christ so as to be *in* the Lord? How can they be made partakers of that *life* which is to be nurtured. By nature they are in Adam and not in Christ; they are the children of the Devil and of course dead unto God. And if they are to become alive unto God in Christ it must be by a Divine transaction—an act on God's part by

which those dead in trespasses and in sins are quickened. This new life is given in Holy Baptism. That which is born of the flesh must be born again of water and the Spirit. Those to whom power is given to become the sons of God are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," said St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, "for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." That means that what has been *promised* to parents and their seed is to be actually *conferred* in Baptism. In that Holy Sacrament the life of God mediated to our humanity by the incarnation of the Son of God is to be made over to us by the Holy Ghost. And hence the written word of God not only sets forth our Holy Religion as a new life in Christ, but speaks so much about the *beginning* of that life in connection with baptism. It is called the "*washing of regeneration*" (Titus iii. 5), *quickening* (Col. ii. 13). It is said that we must be "*born* again" (Jn. iii. 7); *born* of water and the Spirit if we would *see* or *enter* the kingdom of Heaven (Jn iii. 3, 5); born of God and thus become the *sons* of God (Jn. i. 12); saved by water (1 Peter iii. 20, 21). With this regeneration infants have no more to do than with their natural generation. That is an act of God, in his own appointed way and the life thus commenced underlies and precedes, all consciousness, all thought, all faith, hope, and charity. If we say any thing else we not only ignore the analogy between our natural and spiritual life, but we declare plainly that children who have been made partakers of the first Adam's sinful nature without their own knowledge and consent cannot be made partakers of the Second Adam's righteousness without some greater conscious agency. They can die in the one but not be made alive in the other. And where then is the gracious counterpart of their ruined condition, in Christ? The whole ground and scope of human existence is not covered by the person and work of Christ. Children at least cannot regain in Him, all that they lost in their first parent. Sin may abound where grace cannot abound.

From all this we see that the children of Christian parents sustain a new and vital relation to Christ in virtue of their baptism. The covenant and promise bestowed upon parents included their seed. By baptism they are planted together in the likeness of the Saviour's death that in that position they may rise in the likeness of His resurrection. Those who are baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and if thereafter they change their relation to God, it must be by departing from Him, and not by coming to Him. "Those who are baptized are represented as in the same position as Noah in the ark, saved if they go not out of it. Those in the covenant saved if they break not from it. To be nurtured in the covenant is to be nurtured in Christ. Hence we find that the Scriptures always speak of those that are covenanted in baptism, as His people,—as in a gracious position and state as heirs. They are always addressed as such; you are my people, forsake me not, "you have promises and hopes cast them not away. Children in the Church are represented as planted in the house of the Lord, where they are to grow in grace being nurtured into the full stature of men in Christ, by the resources which the church furnishes." *

But whatever life and grace is thus imparted to the child by the blessed influence and energizing power of the Holy Spirit in baptism must be regarded as in the form of a *germ;* and as in the world of nature so in the sphere of grace there may be and are, thousands of possibilities that are never realized. The acorn may contain the oak potentially and yet never put forth a sprout in token of the fact; many beautiful and promising buds never come to fruit, and simply because the conditions required are not present. Just so, certain conditions are required in order that the life of God in the soul may be continued and developed. As in the case of the adult so in the case of the child, this divine life must be nourished and fed; *and here is a duty that God requires at the hand of parents.* The obligation to bring up those who have been placed in a saving relation to

* Dr. Harbaugh's sermon on Parochial Schools.—*Mer. Rev.*

Christ, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord is an essential part of their Christian duty. It flows out of the duty of having their children baptized as a necessary counterpart. The whole obligation of parents is not fulfilled when that initiatory sacrament has been administered to their offspring. On the other hand when they thus recognize the duty which they owe to their children, they openly express their desire that they may grow up in the knowledge and fear of God, and not only have life, but have it more abundantly; and they promise that they will faithfully strive by the grace of God, that nothing shall be wanting on their part to effect this holy and blessed end. Those promises are all recorded in heaven, and those who make them are solemnly and really expected to fulfil them. When God made the covenant with Abraham to be a God to his seed after him in their generations, He said, "I know Abraham that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him." (Gen. xviii. 19). Here it expressly states that Abraham was to do his part *in order that* the Lord might realize to him the blessing guaranteed in the covenant. And thus every man and woman among us is bound to be true to his or her engagement, before it can be expected that God will fulfil the pledges of love He has given to us in regard to our children. He has not promised to confirm the hope that is in us of our children in such a way as to keep them from sin and in the way of holiness independently of any thing that we may do or fail to do. We are the instruments by which this is to be effected, and if we withold our influence, and refuse to be made instruments according to His purpose, we have no right to expect any thing at His hands. Having received our children in Christ as heirs of His kingdom upon pledges of our fidelity, He has commanded us to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; to train them up in the way that they should go, and *then* He has promised that they shall "not depart from it."

The obligation that parents are thus under to bring up their

children in the Lord being thus established from the nature of the case as well as from plain declarations of Scripture, it is evident that this duty must commence at the very dawn of the child's existence—long before it is susceptible of Sunday School instruction. When we are told to "train up" a child in the way that he should go, it is meant that we should so "*train it up,*" not let it first grow up in sin and then try to reclaim it by some uncertain event which may be brought to bear in its mind upon its eternal welfare. That were to give the world, the flesh and the devil all the vantage ground—to yield the advantages of its earliest years when it is most susceptible of good and lasting impressions. This, alas! is too often done, and the result of it is too frightful to be told. In many of the cases in which it is done, the probabilities are that those thus neglected will never be brought to a full surrender to the claims of religion. Satan always takes advantage of our neglect. The neglected ones become attached to the world, engrossed in its interests and insensible to the claims of God; and unless He interferes by some extraordinary manifestation of His mercy, upon which we have no right to presume, there is every reason to suppose that they will go on until they sink into the bottomless pit to rise no more forever. Thousands are thus carried down to eternal death simply because of paternal neglect. And yet with the practical results of this system before our eyes we are often asked to peril the immortal interests of our children through some infidel idea that the Spirit of God is not expected to operate upon their hearts, or through fear of giving a wrong bias to their minds on the subject of religion.* "These things ought not so to be." The duty of the parent to his child commences at the hour of its birth. On entering the world, the infant, a sensitive mass of passive organized matter, enclosing the germ of a spiritual being, is committed for protection and nurture to the care and offices of parents.

It has been truly said that "Nurture precedes, in order, education or training. As the germ of the vine is nourished in

* Rousseau's theory and the theory of a great many others who would not like to be classed with him or take the consequence of his system.

the bosom of the earth, and nurtured out of it, so the life of nurture is moulding the infant being before it is sufficiently aware of the outward world to be affected by its reasons and regulations in such a way as is involved in the idea of education. Hence nurture includes those more hidden and delicate appliances which exert so great an influence on the infant being without its own will, knowledge, or co-operation. Months elapse before it can understand the simplest word, during which time the impressions made upon it, are conveyed by the mode in which it is physically treated by those around it; by the tones of their voices and the expressions of their countenances. And no one has a right to say that its spiritual nurture has not already begun; that as to any effect upon its character, it is a matter of indifference whether the manifestations to which it is subjected are gentle or rough, whether the tones that fall upon its ears are affectionate and soothing, or harsh and irritating; whether the countenances to which it looks up always beam with kindness and love, or are frequently darkened with the frown and glare of evil passions." Like begets like. It is a law of our nature as well as of matter that we will become assimilated to what is around us even in unconscious infancy. Even then the child is to be met with the assimilative power of the eye, the temper and the spirit. And when the receptive faculties begin to expand, when the mind, naturally inquisitive and thirsting for knowledge and at the same time docile and credulous, begins to seek after truth, even then is the babe, in Christ to be fed with the pure milk of the word. A sense of its natural depravity is to be impressed upon it before the thick incrustations of sin have made it insensible to the fact. With this depravity the holiness of God should be contrasted. The child should be especially familiarized with the fact that Christ Jesus, the God-man, has made the atonement, and that in Him it may regain all it ever lost in the first Adam. It should be impressed with the near and endearing relation which it is brought to sustain to Christ in virtue of its baptism,—that God has already become its reconciled Father for Christ's sake." And with His word and example before it, it is to be taught that His life is to be

the pattern of its own, a way that it may by the operation of the Holy Spirit be able to say the life that I now live I live not of myself but Christ liveth in me. Every tendency to sin is to be promptly met by word, by precept and by example in such a way as to counteract it, by the blessing of God. Thus the principles of holiness as believed in the heart, confessed with the mouth and practiced in the life are to be diligently inculcated into the children as they grow up. Like Timothy they are to be indoctrinated from their youth up in the holy scriptures which are able to make them wise unto salvation through the faith which is in Christ Jesus, and exhorted to continue in the things which they have learned. Thus they are to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Their progress is to be in the light which beams upon the "path of the just, shining more and more unto the perfect day."

It is of course not said here that the child can be made a Christian by the unaided influence and teaching of the parent. It may be brought by the force of example to a kind of correctness of moral action, and yet not grow in the Divine life. It may be well grounded in doctrine and orthodoxy, and yet have no saving knowledge of the truth in its heart. But if Christian nurture and instruction is commenced early and followed up prayerfully, the receptive faculties of the child will take in the spiritual food thus afforded to it, and the *Holy Spirit will so sanctify all* that the new life will be sustained and manifest itself outwardly by the peaceable fruits of holiness.

But while it is true that this blessed work is not to be achieved by the unaided influence and teachings of parents, it is no insignificant fact that the duty of Christian nurture is especially enjoined upon them in God's Holy Word. For as God has made this duty incumbent upon them, so He has afforded them every advantage for its proper performance. "For," as has been justly said by another, "during the period that the opening faculties are in that absorbent state which makes them liable to drink in every impression, the child is completely submerged in the waters of paternal influence. Its very being finds its prototype in theirs, and it instinctively acknowledges the sym-

pathy and support it receives at their hands as the necessary complement of its well being. They are its oracles in matters of religious truth, their opinions and practice its standard of right in questions of moral obligation.

The parent too, is invested with authority over the child, but even proper *discipline* must be exercised in the spirit of love. This unfortunately is not always borne in mind, and to this may be attributed the fact that the corrections which parents administer are so often of no avail. It very frequently happens that parents inflict punishment upon a child, not so much to reform the action of the child as to gratify an angry feeling on their own part, which may have been provoked by its disobedience. The severity or lightness of the punishment depends upon the mere humor of the parent. In an impulsive moment the punishment is almost brutal, while if the parent's own excitement is allowed to pass off, the child is suffered to escape entirely. And this is true not only of corporeal punishment, but also of the rebukes and reproofs which parents sometimes administer. It is not an uncommon thing for parents to censure, not on account of any thing really censurable in their children, but because of a constitutional or habitual ill humor peculiar to themselves. When this is the case it will be apparent to the child and produce a bad instead of a good effect, and such parents need not be at all surprised if they find their children self-willed and passionate like themselves. Hence the command of the Apostle, "Ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath, lest they be discouraged." The spirit of the one will be transmitted to the other, and parents should see to it that the faults they are called upon to correct in their children are not simply their own faults reflected in their children. He that has the spirit of a friend cannot help but communicate the spirit of a friend, just as truly as he that has the spirit of Christ cannot help but communicate the spirit of Christ.

It is evident from all this that the parent in order to do his whole duty must not only teach the doctrine of a Christian but live the life of a Christian. Religion is not to be a matter outside of him, called to his aid, now and then, on particular

occasions and under certain circumstances. It must be in him and speak out of him continually. The spirit of Christ is to pervade his whole being and characterize his severest action.

But if parents themselves are true Christians, "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," always bearing about the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifest in their bodies, and make use of the means of Christian culture, their tender offspring will by the blessing of the Holy Spirit become babes and sucklings in Christ to perfect His praise. The piety of the parent will become the piety of the child. It will be perpetuated in the line of family succession; not indeed by ordinary generation, nor by any mere assimilation, not in any way in which we have not an instance in the Bible, but as we are told the faith of Timothy dwelt first in his grand-mother Lois, and then in his mother Eunice, and last of all in him also, although his father was a Greek. (2 Tim. i. 5).

If a child is thus nurtured in the real divine life, we need not necessarily suppose that a technical experience or sudden violent transition is necessary to constitute it a Christian. The duty of consecration and nurture rightly performed, it may be expected that the germ of a new life already imparted to the child in baptism will be developed, and that the child will grow up a Christian without remembering any particular moment or set of conscious exercises by which it became a child of God. That germ we have a right to presume has been imparted to it in the earliest stages of its existence, and then by continued nurture its advancement in the divine life will be just as certain, just as uniform and just as continuous as its advancement in natural life. As it grows up from childhood to manhood, so from being a babe in Christ it will attain to the fulness of stature of a man or a woman in Christ. Thus its *whole* life will be devoted to God, instead of only the latter part of it. Upon arriving at the proper age it will be fitted and willing to take its place in the Church, and thus the family would be the nursery and feeder of the Church.

Of course now it cannot be expected that the neglect of the duties thus naturally and constitutionally devolving upon Chris-

tian parents can be made up in any other way. It is especially a wrong idea to suppose that all can be safely committed to the care of a Sunday School. For, besides the fact intimated throughout this article, that it is a long while before the child is fitted by age and preparation to receive Sunday School instruction, Sunday Schools as now conducted are often notoriously inefficient in their operations. At best they never were intended to supplant the family, and so long as they are regarded as mere human institutions having their end within themselves as institutions;—so long as they are built up by the side of the Church to teach children religious truth, to be sure, but vaguely and indefinitely, and then dismiss them at a certain age into the world instead of into the Church, it will be found that instead of effecting the most general good, they will stand injuriously between the family and the Church, by assuming the functions of both and performing the duties of neither. And this is the tendency and the danger now. When Sunday Schools were first established they were intended for those who had no parents, or whose parents were indifferent to the eternal interests of their children. And for a long time afterwards they were regarded as mere auxiliaries to Christian parents and pastors. But, in these last days, they are too often looked upon as mere spiritual foundling hospitals, at the gates of which parents may place their little ones, and thus avoid not only the performance, but even the acknowledgment of their duty. To these, many a parent says, "Take this child, and nurse it for me," with all the magisterial confidence of Pharaoh's daughter, when she found the young Hebrew in the bulrushes. And it turns out none the better, but all the worse in this case, that the child is *taken from*, rather than *restored to*, its natural mother. The habit of giving out children to be spiritually nursed may be very convenient, but it is pre-eminently unnatural, and the willingness of parents to do it, shows a want of consideration, and an amount of indifference that is one of the worst features of the case. It seeks to transfer a most solemn personal duty from those whom God, not arbitrarily, but for vital, constitutional reasons, has appointed to the trust;

to those who in the nature of the case cannot be in positions to perform it. It changes God's plan; and this can never be done without affecting, and absolutely endangering any interest. Can it be expected that a pastor or Sunday School teacher, who, however faithful he may be, yet sustains no natural vital relation to a child, and can only meet it at intervals, should make up for the deficiency of parents? Is it any wonder, when parents practically commit the whole religious interest of their children to teachers, who are, at best, but "helpers," that there should be in the midst of all our religious advantages, so much spiritual starvation? Is it any wonder that there should be so much reason to say, with the prophet: "The tongue of the sucking child cleaveth to the roof of his mouth: the young children ask bread, and no man breaketh it to them?" Ah! however good, and great, and glorious, Sunday Schools have been, better disband them at once, if they are to become the mere scapegoat for paternal neglect.

There is no need for this, however. Sunday Schools may, if kept in their own proper sphere, and made to co-operate with the family and the Church, become gracious helps to the one, and feeders to the other; and, in this way, they should be improved and encouraged. The abuse of a system is no argument against its proper use.

But, it may be added, that even allowing Sunday Schools to be ever so efficient as far as their operations extend, they are not sufficient to cover the whole ground of religious *education*. It is preposterous to suppose that one hour in the week spent in religious instruction, will answer the spiritual wants of the child, if it is to be subjected to the counteracting influences of mere worldly thought and feeling, during all the rest of the time. And, it is therefore evident, that so far as the education of the child is entrusted to any other hands than those of parents and faithful Sunday School teachers; it should of right be conducted in Christian schools, in which the spirit of piety would be infused into every educational operation—where the intellectual part of man would not be cultivated to the exclusion of, and, therefore, at the expense of, the best affections of the

heart. And it is to be hoped, that the day is not far distant, 'when schools will be established in all our various congregations, in which the Bible will not be regarded as contraband, or only tolerated without word or comment from the teacher, as in some of our State systems. The Church owes it to herself to establish schools in which the law will be 'the law of life and grace in Christ, and not merely the pamphlet laws of an ever-changing legislative body, administered by an ever-changing committee of directors.' And when this is done, the teacher will be no mere hireling of the State for a few months, but a functionary of the Church, whose piety will insure his usefulness—a teacher, who is not merely asked by a commitee, 'Do you know science?' but one, whom the Saviour himself has asked, over, and over, and over again, 'Lovest thou me?' before he gave him the awfully solemn and responsible commission, 'Feed my lambs.'" *

There is no danger of pushing this matter too far. We are not afraid of claiming too much for our holy religion. The whole being of man is to be sanctified by it. The chief end of his existence is to glorify God. It is a libel against the high and holy destiny of man, to say that the great aim of his education is to fit him for the mere business transactions of this life. His highest interests lie beyond the fleeting things of time, and we cannot crowd the care of those interests into one hour in the week. Our life, as a whole, is a moment given to fit us for a glorious hereafter; and, in our education, the world must be secondary to religion—not religion secondary to the avocations of the world. And even looking at the matter with regard to ends of usefulness in mere time, it must be admitted that science, and art, and trade, are never so prosperous as when ennobled and sanctified by the religion of Jesus. "Godliness is profitable to all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come;" and if we "seek first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness, all things will be added unto us."

"It must be admitted, of course, that religious culture and

* Parochial Schools.

education may be conducted in such a manner as will make them irksome to children, and create a disrelish for these holy mysteries, which it will be hard afterwards to overcome. But if parents and teachers would present the truth intelligently, affectionately, attractively, and above all, prayerfully, there would be no reason to fear such results. The Holy Spirit is promised to them as their guide; and faithful instruction and action on their part would 'secure the first buddings of the plants of grace,' and pastors would only have to develop them, by appropriate cultivation, to 'trees of righteousness,' filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God." *

Thus, we repeat, the family and the school would become the nurseries of the Church. All infant members thus brought up, at a proper age, recogizing their relations, would gratefully and intelligently assume the responsibilities involved in their early consecration by their parents, and thus *the law of the increase and expansion of the Christian families, would become the law of the increase of the Christian Church.* "Piety, too, beginning in early life, would assume, progressingly, lovelier and more influential forms of manifestation from generation to generation, so that the 'child would die a hundred years old.' The dew of youth, the strength of manhood, and the ripeness of age, would all be given to God and his cause." † Thus from the bosom of the Church would rise up many bright lights to show forth the glory of the Lord, and contend valiantly against the arch foes of our race. The few remaining allies of Satan would be brought back to God, and these taken from him, his kingdom would totter and fall; realizing the promise that the seed of the faithful should not only be as sands of the sea-shore, but also possess the gates of their enemies.

And we may be assured of this; that if the parents are careful to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord to train them in the way that they should go, when they get old *they will not depart from it.* We know that this

* Dr. Riddle on Organic Christianity. † *Ibid.*

is questioned by many. Declare this fact to some men, and they will shake their heads knowingly; and pointing to some case in which a man of apparent piety has a notoriously ungodly child, say, "It is contradicted by experience." In other words, they will say, "It is not true." Not true? Who says that it *is* true? *God.* God tell an untruth! Nay, let God be true, though every man a liar. It is true; as much so as anything else written in His blessed word.

> "They struggle vainly to preserve a part
> Who have not courage to contend for all."

And what is more, it is confirmed by the facts in the case, as an examination of genealogies in connection with religious statistics will show. Where this promise has not appeared to be verified the fault has always been with men and not with God. He always does His part, and it is an awful thing for us to palm the consequences of our ignorance or misdirected zeal upon the Almighty. If only men were true to their trust, the Divine fidelity would be illustrated in every case. He would fulfil the promise made to all the faithful when He said, "My Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever."

This subject has an immense practical bearing. For since God has committed this important trust to Christian parents, and given them the means to perform their duty, and since He has pledged Himself so to crown their labors that their children will be established in the ways of the Lord, the truth must come home to them with stunning weight that their salvation depends almost entirely upon the fidelity with which they are nurtured in the Lord. Have men a realizing sense of this? Have they not been every where neglectful of the high interest committed to their care? If so, why should they be so longer? why when they bestow most worldly care upon a child's tenderest days,—when they take advantage of its earliest years to give it a secular education, and train it to habits of honesty, industry, and

frugality that it may take care of its worldly interests, why will they overlook these far higher interests? Why send their children forth from their thresholds ladened with worldly goods and yet allow them to go down to eternal death with the seal of God's covenant upon their heads? Why suffer them to lie like so much dry drift wood along the stream of time, to be swept away by every rising wave of temptation, when they might by paternal fidelity be as living trees in the Lebanon of our God? He has made Christian parents the nurturers and guardians of a Divinely implanted life in their children and they are bound to nurture and guard it. He has placed them at a very Thermopylæ where they may by His grace defend it against the sins that come like Persian hosts against it, and if they forsake their post, or commit it to another, until all is lost, with them will rest the awful responsibility.

Art. VII.—FORMS OF PRAYER.

BY REV. J. S. FOULK, A. M., THIRD CHURCH, BALTIMORE, MD.

Extemporaneous or free prayer has become so common, that many are disposed to cry out against all forms of prayer, and to condemn their stated and regular use, as prescribed, in the Order of Worship, for the Service on the Lord's Day, as calculated to promote lifelessness and dulness in the devotional services of the sanctuary. Without examining the subject at all, and with no other guide but their own feelings, which are just as likely to be wrong as right, there are many who very magisterially pronounce all Liturgical worship as unscriptural, and suited only for such as have the form, but are destitute of the life and power of godliness. It is no uncommon thing to hear such declare, that a truly pious and devout worshipper would be chilled and frozen to death in such an atmosphere, and amid such formality. It is not to be wondered at, that persons habituated from childhood to the mode of worship, as it obtains

so generally in the sanctuaries of our Reformed Church, should denounce all liturgical forms as calculated to chain down the spirit, and prevent its upward rising to the throne of grace with that unction and importunate pleading, which belong only, as they contend, to extempore prayer. It is not to be wondered at, that with such antecedents, many should be ready to declare that sincerity and earnestness, and fervor and spirituality can exist only where the aspirations of the devout soul are left to ascend freely, and without attaching to them any clogs or weights in the shape of liturgical formularies. Prejudice has a powerful influence upon the mind, and thousands are thus blinded to the excellencies and advantages of united and common prayer, uttered by the voice of the whole congregation. We all know how soon habit becomes second nature. And whether we are willing to admit it or not, it is nevertheless so, that we are fully as much disposed to cling to, and most tenaciously to defend a religious habit, which has grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength, as we are to hold on to any other habit which we have been taught to look upon as right and good. It does not, therefore, excite our wonder, or fill us with the least surprise, that many such should be found indulging in bitter invective against all forms of prayer, and ridiculing their use as a mere mummery of words, in which the heart is not engaged, or as crutches for ministers who lack the ability or the power to pray without them.

But invective is not argument, and ridicule is not the test of truth. How much better to admit with all candor and sincerity, with all forbearance and charity, that in this respect, as well as in others, there is such a thing as imbibing errors in infancy, and cherishing them in manhood, and even in declining age. Let us root out our prejudices and scatter them to the winds, and then come to the Holy Scriptures with a free and unbiassed mind, and we shall find forms of prayer scattered over the pages both of the Old and New Testament. The use of forms was sanctioned by God himself in the Jewish Church. He *enjoined* them upon the people, whom His own right hand

had redeemed from the house of bondage. Extemporaneous prayers were not so much as named, nor were they known among the Jews. All was form, and prescribed by God Himself. That the worship of the Temple was not celebrated in the unpremeditated or extemporaneous form, is evident from the direction given to the Levites "to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even," "according to the order commanded unto them" (2 Chron. xxiii. 30, 31). On one occasion David delivered a particular "psalm to thank the Lord, into the hand of Asaph and his brethren;" a psalm containing this petition, "Save us, O God of our salvation, and gather us together, and deliver us from the heathen, that we may give thanks to Thy holy name and glory in Thy praise." And when it was repeated, "all the people said, Amen, and praised the Lord" (1 Chron. xvi. 35, 36). From the time of Moses to the period embraced in the ministry of Christ, all Scripture is decidedly in favor of the use of forms of prayer in the public worship of God. The Gospels do not furnish a single instance in which Christ objected to the liturgical services of the Synagogue and Temple. When His disciples, who as Jews had always been accustomed to forms of prayer, requested Him to teach them how to pray, He gave them that beautiful formulary, "Our Father who art in heaven." In the Acts of the Apostles, we find that they used forms. The conclusion, then, cannot be avoided that in rejecting them, and substituting an unpremeditated mode of worshiping God, we have followed our own fancy, and not the example of Christ and His Apostles. After examining this subject with all the candor and honesty we could summon, the conviction has fastened itself upon our mind, that *in the light of Apostolic example, and the custom of the Church in its best and purest ages*, this mode of conducting the devotions of God's people cannot be defended. An attempt has been made to do this by Timothy Dwight and a host of kindred spirits, but they have most signally failed. With minds full of prejudice for all forms, and contempt for the very name of liturgy, with minds as firmly wedded to the idea that free prayer was the most scriptural, as they were to

their rigid and soul-freezing systems of Theology, they were wholly incapacitated to determine the true character of Apostolic prayer. They ignored the fact, that forms of prayer were used in the Jewish Temple and Synagogue, that this particular feature was transferred to the Christian Church when Christ gave His disciples that Pattern-prayer, and said: "*After this manner*, therefore, pray ye." Although Christ kept up a striking resemblance of the Christian to the Jewish Church, in the appointment of twelve Apostles answering to the twelve princes of the tribes of Israel, and in the institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper answering to Circumcision and the Passover, yet upon this point they ignored any conformity to the ancient mode of worship. They ignored the strong testimony borne by the precomposed forms of Peter, and James, and Mark, which have come down to us, along with a commentary on the Liturgy ascribed to the Apostle James, written by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth century. They ignored the fact, which stands out so prominently on the pages of the New Testament, that the Apostles made use of forms in their joint devotions, and that some of the prayers they repeated "*with one accord*" have been preserved by the Holy Ghost for our instruction and imitation.

Immediately after the triumphant ascension of their Lord from the "Mount called Olivet," the Apostles returned to Jerusalem, and convened as a worshiping congregation in "an upper room," which was no doubt sufficiently private and retired to render them secure from the fury of those who had crucified their Master. Here "these all continued *with one accord* in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." It is not said that Peter, or James, or John, or any of the other brethren, lifted up *his* voice, and prayed in the name of all. Whenever the Apostle preached the Gospel, then all voices were hushed, every eye was intently fixed upon, and every ear open to the words of the speaker. On the day of Pentecost, although all the Apostles were present, there is no such language as this employed in reference to the preaching. This was not *with*

one accord; they never united their voices in the delivery of sermons to the people. Then the inspired historian speaks in a different style, and says: "Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up *his* voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judea," &c. And so, whenever the Apostles preached, no matter how many of them were present, one only is spoken of as imparting instruction, and the congregation is described as listening. And why this difference in the preaching and praying of the Apostles? Is there not something remarkable in the fact that whenever they engaged in devotional exercises, the plural pronoun should be used? Then it is no longer Peter, or Stephen, or Paul lifting up *his* voice and preaching Christ, but it is the whole congregation of believers lifting up *their* voices in prayer and supplication.

The expression "*with one accord*" is explained by Scripture itself, and is most incontrovertibly shown to be not merely a *unity in the matter*, as some would fain persuade themselves, but a *unity in the very form of prayer*. In Acts i. 24, 25, we read: "And *they* prayed and said;" then comes the form in which every voice united, "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas, by transgression, fell, that he might go to his own place." And to place the matter beyond all doubt, and convince the most skeptical that this was the usual custom of the primitive Church, we are told that when Peter and John had frustrated the design of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and had boldly asserted their determination to obey God rather than man, and to preach Christ and Him crucified, they again joined "their own company." And when this company of believers had heard the report of "all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them," what did they do? Did one of the Apostles, in the name of the company, offer up a prayer of thanksgiving to God for the deliverance of Peter and John from the fury of their adversaries? St. Luke tells us, that "when they heard that," they lifted up their voice to God *with one accord*, and said,—then comes the form in which they all joined audibly,

running through seven verses, and which the Holy Ghost has caused to be recorded,—"Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth," &c. (Acts iv. 24–30.)

In all their public assemblies, it is recorded of the primitive Christians—*They lifted up their voice and prayed with one accord.* And if they were not in the habit of using a form of words, why should we have, at the very outset of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, two forms of prayer preserved, in the use of which every voice simultaneously united? Ah! we cannot escape the conclusion that God thus teaches us how blessed was the harmony and concord, and how beautiful and comely was the order, whenever the disciples approached Him in prayer and supplication. They did not trust to come into His dread presence—they had too little confidence in their own abilities—they were filled with too much of that humility and lowliness of heart, recommended by the Saviour, to take their position before the sovereign Ruler of heaven and earth, and address Him in solemn prayer, without a precomposed and premeditated form, couched in such language, and made up of such petitions, as the understanding and the heart approve, and upon which the affections can rise, on strong elastic wing, in their flight to the throne of grace.

With all the praises bestowed upon free and extemporaneous prayer, and with a full sense of its advantages in the present posture of the Protestant Church, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, which experience and observation so fully attest, the tendency which it has to inflate men with a favorable and most exalted opinion of their talents in this direction, and to make them spiritually proud, boastful and uncharitable. We cannot conceal from ourselves the mournful fact, that even ministers of the Gospel, caring more for the admiration of men than the applause of God, sometimes strive in this very way to build up for themselves a reputation for brilliant ideas, and eloquent appeals to God. We cannot blot out from our memory what our ears have been so often pained to hear—the irreverent and blasphemous familiarity with which men approach God—the low and cant phraseology and hackneyed expressions employed

with such freezing and deadening formality—the "praying at" those who may have injured them with the tongue, or by their conduct, in disgusting and retaliatory style—and the preaching of which so many are guilty, when they expatiate upon the doctrinal articles of our holy religion, or the institutions and obligations of Christianity. From all such and other evils which might be specified, and which are the bitter fruits of leaving men to follow the thoughts and inclinations of their own hearts in public prayer, we have need to humble ourselves in the very dust, and to cry out in the words of the Litany, "Good Lord, deliver us." And these evils loudly admonish us of the necessity of returning to the *old paths*—the paths trodden by the Apostles and a countless multitude now before the throne of God. No matter what may be our views and feelings in reference to this matter, one thing is certain, if we have no heart to pray with such words as the Holy Ghost teaches, or with such petitions as eminently pious and devout men of the early Church clothed the aspirations of their souls when they drew near the Mercy Seat, we can have no heart to lift up our affections to God with words of our own.

But to return to the forms of prayer, used on the two occasions referred to by the Apostles. These must have been previously made known and explained to the assemblies. In no other way can we account for the vocal union and agreement, unless we ascribe it to the immediate interposition of the Holy Spirit, and this would only enhance the value of the authority in favor of forms. It would only prove that upon sudden and unprepared emergencies, they were miraculously furnished with suitable forms by the intervention of the Almighty Himself. In whatever way this symphony and unanimity in prayer was brought about, it is quite certain that "*they said*" the same words, and must therefore have been familiar with the form. In their *public* devotions they did not pray extemporaneously—on the spur of the moment—uttering whatever came uppermost. This was not the case in the Jewish Church. And there is not a syllable of authority from the great Founder of the Christian Church to show, that He changed the mode of

prayer, but on the contrary there is both precept and example to enforce it.

The disciples came to Jesus and said: "*Lord, teach us to pray as John also taught his disciples.*" The greatest prophet that was born of a woman prepared a form for His disciples, and we have here the authority of the Baptist quoted, and employed as an argument with the Saviour for furnishing those whom He had called to follow Him with a devotional formulary. How easy would it have been to express His disapprobation, and to counsel His disciples against the use of forms! How easy would it have been to tell them, that they must pray extemporaneously—that their petitions must come warm and glowing from the heart! If in that formal age of the Jewish Church, when all their devotional services were dull and lifeless, and destitute of fervor and unction, not a word of condemnation fell from the lips of the Son of God as to the use of precomposed forms, certainly we ought not to be harsh in our judgment, and condemn such worship as our Revised Liturgy prescribes, lest perchance we should be found fighting against God.

The worship of the ancient Temple was liturgical, and so was also that of the Synagogue. The Saviour by His frequent visits to these places, countenanced and sanctioned this mode, and He doubtless took part in the devotions of God's people, and thus used with them their prescribed forms. And the Apostles imitated the example of their Lord, and frequently repaired to Jewish places of worship. In Acts iii. 1, we are told that "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer."

While the Saviour reproved the Jews for their hypocrisy and wickedness, He never objected to their written forms of prayer. And when His disciples requested such a formulary, He readily responded, and gave them the most simple, beautiful, and comprehensive prayer the world has ever seen. On all occasions when they came together, we believe that the disciples and the early Christians made use of this model-form. With it they were all familiar, and could therefore lift up their voices, and

unite in the repetition *with one accord.* It would require a miracle to convince us, that these holy men disregarded the express command of the Master:—"After this manner, therefore,"—in the use of this form,—"pray ye." We are well aware, that a different sense is put into these words by anti-liturgical commentators. But we prefer deriving our authority from the early Church. Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and others, put the construction just named upon these words. Cyprian says: "Christ himself gave us a form of prayer, and *commanded us to use it*, because when we speak to the Father in the Son's words, we shall be more easily heard."

> "In doubtful questions 'tis the safest way,
> To learn what unsuspected ancients say,
> For tis not likely we should higher soar
> In search of heaven than all the Church before."—DRYDEN.

Could all our congregations be induced to trample their prejudices in the dust, and follow the example of the primitive Christians so far as to lift up their voices *with one accord* in the repetition of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer along with the minister, and to follow his petitions at proper intervals with the loud and hearty AMEN! it would not be long before they would be prepared to adopt a full liturgical service. And in such a service they would feel that the true idea of worship was realized, and that prayer was best performed when addressed to God according to the theory and spirit, which pervade and animate the Lord's Prayer, made up as it is of worship, petition, ascription and doxology.

> "There is a joy, which angels well may prize;
> To see, and hear, and aid God's worship, when
> Unnumber'd tongues, a host of Christian men,
> Youths, matrons, maidens, join. Their sounds arise
> 'Like many waters:' now glad symphonies
> Of thanks and glory to our God; and then
> Seal of the social prayer, the loud Amen!
> Faith's common pledge: Contrition's mingled cries.
> Thus when the Church of Christ was hale and young,
> She call'd on God, one spirit and one voice:
> Thus from corruption cleans'd, with health new strung
> Her sons she nurtur'd. O, be theirs the choice,
> What duty bids, to worship heart and tongue,
> At once to pray, at once in God rejoice."—MANT.

For this unanimity in the public devotions of the sanctuary, we have a number of precepts. Our Saviour makes a vocal union and agreement in prayer necessary to our success at a throne of grace. "If two of you shall AGREE on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." The word translated "agree" is much stronger in the original Greek. It is *συμφωνήσωσιν* compounded of *συν*, together, and *φωνή*, voice. The English word *symphony*, which is derived from this, expresses the idea. The passage, then, should read thus: If two of you speak together—symphonize or lift up the voice together—as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. This precept of the Son of God, in conection with the form He gave His disciples, and His own uniform attendance on the ritual services of the Jewish Synagogue, present a formidable array of evidence in favor of liturgical worship. They constitute a three-fold cord, which cannot be broken.

The example of Christ and the Apostles, and all their teachings, if they are worth anything at all in determining so important a question, plainly show that the sacred offices of religion—the prayer, the praises, the confessions and the thanksgivings, were to be fixed and prescribed, and not left to every man's private will and fancy to make and alter as he pleased. This point we conceive to be as evident as the day, and as clear as the sun in the heavens. On no other supposition or principle could St. Paul have admonished the Romans in language like this,—"That ye may *with one mind and one mouth* glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." On no other principle could he have exhorted the Corinthians to "speak all the same things," and "be perfectly joined together in the same mind," so that the unlearned might be able to utter the familiar "*Amen*" at their "giving of thanks." On no other principle could believers in the days of St. Paul have joined him in his own declaration,—"I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

While they prayed and sang with the spirit, with warmth and earnestness, they took care to do it with a "form of sound words," such as Timothy was exhorted to hold fast,—with a clear understanding of every word they uttered. We have the unanimous testimony of all antiquity, that the Apostles and primitive Christians were not more addicted to singing and making melody in their hearts to the Lord with precomposed "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," than they were to supplicate God's mercy and forgiveness, His grace and heavenly benediction, with precomposed prayers. The Fathers continually allude to this feature of divine worship. Irenæus who was the disciple of Polycarp, the friend of St. John—and Tertullian, who labored in distant Africa, within seventy years of the Apostles, speak of it. In their writings there is no evidence that public worship was conducted in any other way. They speak of liturgical worship as having been observed from the beginning. We might as well doubt, that there were such men as Justin Martyr, who speaks of "common prayer," and Origen, who speaks of "constituted prayers," as entertain a doubt that when believers prayed in the days of the Apostles, as well as afterwards, they prayed *not only* with the spirit, *but with the understanding also*,—in a form of words upon which the mind had been enabled to exercise its judgment. And this mode of worship was never intermitted until Puritanism reared its head in the Church.

Our position is simply this, nothing more nor less, that when the disciples prayed in their joint capacity, they offered *premeditated prayers*, just as when they sang God's praises, they tuned their voices, and all *with one accord* joined in the words of a precomposed form. We do not take the ground, that they had a full and complete liturgy, from which they read their prayers. We would just as soon think of contending for a full and complete Hymn Book, from which they selected a psalm or hymn suitable to the subject or occasion, and then united heart and voice in the high praises of their Saviour God. They had neither the one, nor the other, and yet in praise and prayer they made use of precomposed forms, just as they had done in the

synagogue and Temple before their conversion. In the modern acceptation they had no books in those days. It may not be a comfortable thought to many, but it is nevertheless so, that the objection so triumphantly urged against liturgies, based upon the admission we have made, that the prayers were not read, holds with equal force, and with the same crushing weight, against Hymn-Books. When our Lord, just before entering the Garden of Gethsemane, "sung an hymn" with His disciples, will any one assert, that they stood around Him with hymn-books, or even with manuscripts in their hands? When Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises unto God in their dark prison chamber, they had neither a liturgy nor a hymn-book open before them, and had they been in possession of this modern convenience, so admirably adapted to the purposes of public worship, they could not have used them at the dead hour of midnight. Those who so strenuously oppose praying from the book, should also oppose singing from the book. There is no consistency,—all antiquity would repudiate the idea,—in holding the hymn-book in our hands, while with our feet we trample the liturgy in the dust beneath us. The Apostles used forms both in prayer and in praise. These were few and simple, but in process of time liturgies and hymn-books became necessary and were introduced, and thus the Church was provided, under the guidance and direction of her Great Head, with formularies for all her devotional and consecratory services. The New Testament does not in so many words command us to use liturgies;—*neither does it command us to use hymn-books, to build churches, or to baptize infants.* But as Christians have thrown themselves on the authority of the Old Testament in the erection of their churches, and the admission of children into Christ's kingdom, even so have they found it to edification to observe the same mode of worship which God prescribed for the Israelites. The New Testament most plainly settles the principle, and the example of both the Master and the household has established the great principle of liturgical worship.

As the Christian year with its three holy seasons of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost,—its first beginnings,—gradually

unfolded itself into the beautiful and systematic order as it now holds, with suitable Gospels and Epistles for each day, challenging the admiration of the Church and of the world, even so was it with Liturgies and Hymn-Books. In reference to precomposed prayers and hymns, we can adopt the language of Dr. Nevin on the Christian Year, and say: "They do not necessarily appear at once in their completeness. They have a history, a genesis, through which they reveal themselves under various forms, rising from what may be considered their rude beginnings only, to that which constitutes at last their absolute consummation. Wide differences characterize these forms; but through all such differences they are still found to represent and express fundamentally the same idea of law. So much indeed is implied by the supposition of any real history in the case. The idea of precomposed forms both of prayer and of praise, is universal, a fact seated in the religious constitution of the world. Under all manifestations, accordingly, it is the same force always working in the same direction. Their different forms are but so many different stages, in the progress of which, they are carried forward to their true ideal perfection."

And what he says of the rejection of the order of services which the Church Year prescribes, will apply to the whole subject of liturgical worship: "Only since the Reformation has the attempt been made, not by Protestantism in general, but by a fragmentary section of Protestantism, to set aside the whole conception as a "relict of superstition," serving to encumber more than to assist the proper spirituality of Christian worship. But of what force can any such isolated judgment be, over against the united mind of the Church in all past centuries, backed as this is, at the same time, by the religious constitution of the world, and by its religious history also, in the most universal view. The exception is too violent, too monstrous, we may say, to stand."

Prior to the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland,—prior to the rise of Puritanism in England,—there is not a single instance on record of public worship being celebrated in any other way. This is a significant fact—a fact which de-

serves to be pondered by all who would set aside the forms of prayer with which the ancient Church worshiped God, for what in *their wisdom*, is deemed a more spiritual and excellent way. We may be unwilling to follow in its track, but certainly it requires a high degree of presumption and arrogance to regard the Church for sixteen centuries *as in the wrong*, and as rocking itself to sleep and to death in the *cradle of formality*. We cannot tell by whom the present mode of worship was introduced. But we do know that it was not done by the Reformer John Calvin. He was strenuously opposed to what was then universally regarded as an innovation. In a letter written to the Duke of Somerset, lord protector of England, in the year 1549, he says:—"I do highly approve, that there should be a certain form of prayer and ecclesiastical rites, from which it should not be lawful for the pastors themselves to discede. First, that provision may be made for some people's ignorance and unskilfulness. Second, that the concert of all churches amongst themselves may the more plainly appear. Third, that order may be taken against the desultory levity of such who delight in innovations. Thus there ought to be an established catechism, an established administration of sacrament, and also A PUBLIC FORM OF PRAYER (*publicam item precæ formulam*)."

Even Richard Baxter, author of the Saint's Everlasting Rest, Puritan as he was, could not find it in his heart to speak of forms of prayer in the contemptuous way that many, who claim to be actuated by his spirit, do in our day. He administered a most scathing rebuke to all uncharitable defamers of the sainted dead,—to all who exalt themselves above those whom they regard as mere *formalists*, cold as an iceberg, because they read their prayers from a book. He used these words: "Is it not a high degree of pride to conclude, that almost all Christ's Churches in the world, for these thirteen hundred years at least, to this day, have offered such worship unto God as that you are obliged to avoid it? And that almost all the Catholic Church on earth this day, is below your communion for using forms? And that even Calvin, and the

Presbyterians, Cartwright, Wildersham, and the old non-conformists, were unworthy of your communion?" Let these few quotations from the pages of history suffice. It would savor more of that religion, whose crowning glory it is,—that it clothes its followers with humility and lowliness of mind, were we to form a different estimate of those who regarded themselves as weak, and therefore in need of help,—who counted forms not as clogs and weights to the spiritual mind, but as bands in which they needed to be swathed about, to support their limbs in the walk of faith. And we would not lose either in spirituality or devoutness, were we as children to sit reverently and devoutly at their feet, and pay all deference to their opinions and practices.

> "Might aught beside thine own inherent praise,
> Thy stores adopted from heaven's treasury,
> Mark'd with God's name and genuine imagery,
> Win the charm'd soul to pass her earthly days
> With thee, loved mother! 'tis that she surveys
> In the long record of the times gone by,
> What sweet memorials of a grace from high,
> Shed on THY FAITHFUL SONS, her scroll displays.
> Hail, holy men! by whom of yore was fought,
> True to your CAPTAIN, to his CONSORT true,
> The Christian Fight! The goal your footsteps sought,
> Fain would I, following in your track pursue;
> And fain my soul, her work of trial wrought,
> Would find the haven of her rest with you!"—MANT.

When Christ abolished the covenant of works, He did not abolish all that was outward in its more spiritual successor. The mode of worship was lessened or changed,—new and more simple rites were given in the place of the old; but there were forms still. When He required a more spiritual worship, He remembered that our flesh must needs be exercised. He established a service in which the flesh and the spirit were to be actively employed and to move in unison. He did not merely give forms, for then the flesh only would be brought into subjection. He did not give merely grace, for that were to neglect the flesh, but he united forms and grace together. He breathed into the visible frame-work of outward service the breath of life. He desired to be served both with flesh and

spirit—not with the flesh without the spirit, nor yet with the spirit without the flesh. In the Covenant of Grace, He so arranged as to engage them both. And hence the Church has constructed all its liturgies in such a way as most considerately to employ both flesh and spirit. To reject forms of prayer as being contrary or derogatory to the spirituality of the Gospel service, as being relics of the bondage of the law, and restraints on Christian liberty, would require us, if we wish to be consistent, to set aside all forms, so that the spirit may not be tied down to any outward acts, and this would land us in Quakerism, and constitute us dumb worshippers—no praise, no prayer, no sacramental acts, or outward performances whatever.

In pleading for forms of prayer in the public worship of the sanctuary, it cannot but be evident to every unbiassed reader of the Scriptures and of Ecclesiastical History, that we are vindicating what prophets and apostles, with Christ our Saviour, have practiced, and what primitive Christians and their successors to the sixteenth century were unanimous in adopting. Though it may not accord with the maxims of worldly popularity, or harmonize with the prejudices of many, we prefer bowing to the teachings of the Holy Ghost, and of the Holy Catholic Church. Our motto is:—"Let God be true and every man a liar." "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

True to the principles and practices of the Church as she has stood for centuries, and to which she adhered in her best and purest ages, the founders of the Reformed Church in the Palatinate prescribed an order of service for the Lord's Day, that included liturgical forms of prayer, ending with the Lord's Prayer, *both before and after the sermon.* The Church of the Heidelberg Catechism, in its own home, was liturgical. Of this the old Palatinate Liturgy furnishes incontestable proof. We do not here refer to the Dutch Palatinate Liturgy, published in this country, which omitted much, and added some things that did not belong to it. We refer to the *Kirchen*

Ordnung, prepared for the Reformed Church under Frederick III. in 1563, and which was afterwards amended and improved under the prince, John Casimer, in 1585. A reprint of the edition, published in 1684, was brought to this country by one of the fathers of our Church, the sainted Nicholas Pomp, and is now in the possession of the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D. Long and sacredly may this copy be preserved, to tell to future generations that our Church was originally conformed to the teachings and practices of the Apostles, and of the entire household of faith as she had existed previously. It cannot be denied, that we have forsaken the landmarks which our fathers have set, and been sent adrift from our ancient moorings. Though many may congratulate themselves, that we have abandoned our *ritualistic forms*, as they are pleased to term them, and thrown off the "rag of popery" which our fathers put on us, yet there are many others whose feelings would rather prompt them to exclaim—ICHABOD, "The glory is departed from Israel." Yes, there are many, in whose bosoms sentiments of love and respect and veneration for our Church are engendered, as they transfer themselves to her birth-place and original home, and in company with those who then lived and labored at her altars, "walk about Zion, and go round about her, tell the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks, and consider her palaces." But when they come to tell it to the generations following, "they would fain hang their harps upon the willows and weep, when they remember Zion," departing from the old paths, giving up its liturgical forms, time-honored, full of power, wisdom, and the piety of all ages, and leaving nothing to protect the devotions of the people, to-day, from the strange fire that a heated imagination would bring to the altar, and to-morrow, from the cold nothings which would be offered up upon it.

From the Hessian Agenda, 1657, we learn, that all the services, in the Churches of the Palatinate, before the sermon, took place at the altar, and not in the pulpit. Here again there has been a falling away from the custom of our fathers. One innovation has paved the way for the introduction of

another and another, until a complete revolution was effected in the mode of worship. Along with our abandonment of liturgical forms, the altar-service was given up—nay more, in many instances our altars were "hewn down," and tables placed in their stead. We think it is meet and right, that the spiritual sacrifices of broken and contrite hearts should be offered up, as in days of yore, by the entire priesthood of believers, the minister, as the priest of the congregation, officiating at the altar. Ought he not, before he ascends the pulpit, to stand on the same level with the people, and with them lie low in the dust before God in the confession of sin and the supplication of mercy? Is it not more proper, more in accordance with the idea, as it has always ruled in the Church of the living God, that the devotional services should be conducted at the altar, and that the minister should not enter the pulpit until, in his prophetical character, he takes his stand before the people to instruct them in the mysteries of the Kingdom of God? Nay, is it not the *only proper place* for the priest of the Lord to stand, when he offers to God the spiritual sacrifices of his people? So our Reformed Fathers thought, and so rigidly did they adhere to the idea, that all the duties of the minister performed by him as the priest of the congregation should take place at the altar, as the *proper place* for all such services, that in the Hessian Agenda, already referred to, he was required to descend from the pulpit after the sermon and offer the closing prayer from the Liturgy, and pronounce the benediction at the altar. All honor to those who are striving to reinstate the order for divine services *prescribed by our forefathers*, and to restore practices and customs which, ever since the rise of Puritanism, have gradually been laid aside, and for some generations have become obsolete! and may God hasten the time when ministers and people, with one accord, shall say, Amen!

The pulpit has become the object of attraction—with too many in our Protestant churches the sermon is every thing, and preach—preach—preach—is the everlasting cry. The great mass wend their way to the *House of Preaching* to hear

the sermon, to look up to the pulpit and listen to beautiful and eloquent prayers, just as they do to the sermon. All the praying must be done by proxy. The true idea of worship has been lost sight of. "My house shall be called the *House of Prayer* for all people." It is high time, that the devotional services should occupy the chief place in our sanctuaries, that we should be able to say with St. Paul, "We have an Altar," and that the people should come up to the house of the Lord to pray and praise, as well as hear. It is high time that the altar should be made to occupy a prominent position in front of the pulpit, to remind all who enter the gates of Zion, that prayer is what God requires of all who worship there, and that all may have continually before their eyes an emblem of sacrifice, a type of "things in the heavens," the sweet, holy, joyful place of intercession and prayer. In the language of another, we say, "Give back, thou man of Rome, the cup to a thirsty flock; give back, ye who have forsaken the ancient landmarks, the liturgy to a congregation of dumb worshippers. Let not the cup of blessing be drunk by proxy; let not the great duty of worship by proxy be performed!" And to this we would also add, give back the altar, that when the people go up to the house of God,—they may be able to adopt the language of the Psalmist: "So will I compass thine altar, O Lord: That I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wondrous works." "Let them bring me unto thy holy hill, and to the tabernacles. Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy."

If we would have our church-service conformed to the service of the Mount Zion above, the New Jerusalem, then let us set up the landmarks, and return to the "old paths where is the good way and walk therein." The worship of the Church triumphant is liturgical. Responses are uttered there by ten thousand times ten thousand voices, like the voice of many waters. The lips of the blood-washed throng are not sealed in heaven, and why should not the services of the Church militant be conducted in the same responsive and symphonious way? "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man

could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands, and *cried with a loud voice*, saying: Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb." And then comes the RESPONSE, rising in full swell and solemn cadence before the throne of God. "And all the angels stood round about the throne, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshiped God, saying Amen—Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might be unto our God, for ever and ever. Amen." Why should not the saints on earth follow this glorious order of worship? And then think of the *forms* which, according to St. John, in his Apocalyptic vision, the heavenly hosts daily employ, and let the cheeks of all who object to the use of the forms prescribed by our Liturgy, on account of their sameness, in the services of God's earthly courts, mantle with shame; and let them seriously consider whether the fault does not lie in themselves, that they become, as they complain, so intolerably lifeless and dull. This objection carries with it no weight whatever. *It never comes from those who are accustomed to the use of liturgies.* And if our feelings were right, we would love to unite, *with one accord*, in the repetition of the same forms of prayer, just as we unite, with one accord, in singing God's praises, and never grow tired of repeating the same words in the beautiful and soul-inspiring hymns:

"Alas, and did my Saviour bleed," &c.
"When I can read my title clear," &c.
"Jesus, lover of my soul," &c.
"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," &c.
"I love Thy Kingdom, Lord," &c.

Ah! unless our feelings and sentiments undergo a radical change, and our bitter prejudices be scattered to the winds, will not heaven be to us a place full of formality and dulness? There the saints, *with one accord*, will join—everlastingly join in the repetition of those memorable FORMS: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom,

and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." And again—

> "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power,
> Be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne,
> And unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

In the language of another, we may say most truthfully: "We have only to compare the modern form and usages of church worship, with the responses and Amen service of the Liturgy, its Angelic and Cherubic Hymns, its Therefore with Angels and Archangels, its Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, alongside of the above inspired description, in order to see which is the most like the church-service of the Apocalypse."

And here at this point we shall introduce a remarkable testimony to the thrilling and powerful effect of liturgical worship—*remarkable*, because it is given by a man, whom of all others we should regard as least susceptible of such impressions. The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, of Brooklyn, wrote from Scotland as follows:

"I cannot tell you how much I was affected; I had never had such a trance of worship, and I shall never have such another view until I gain the gate. I am so ignorant of the church-service that I cannot tell the various parts by their right names—but the portions which most affected me were the prayers and responses which the choir sang. I had never heard any part of a supplication—a direct prayer—sung by a choir; and it seemed as though I heard, not with my ear, but with my soul. I was dissolved—my whole being seemed to me like an incense wafted gratefully towards God. The Divine presence rose before me in wondrous majesty, but of ineffable gentleness and goodness; and I could not stay away from more familiar approach, but seemed irresistibly, yet gently, drawn toward God. My soul, then, thou didst magnify the Lord, and rejoice in the God of thy salvation! And then came to my mind the many exaltations of the Psalms of David; and never before were the expressions and figures so noble, and so

necessary, to express what I felt. I had risen, it seemed to me, so high, that I was where David was when his soul conceived the things which he wrote. Throughout the service, and it was an hour and a quarter long, whenever an 'Amen' occurred, it was given by the choir, accompanied by the organ and the congregation. Oh, that swell and solemn cadence yet ring in my ear. Not once, not a single time did it occur in that service, from beginning to end, without bringing tears from my eyes. I stood like a shrub in a spring morning—every leaf covered with dew, and every breeze shook down some drops. I trembled so much at times that I was obliged to sit down. Oh, when in the prayers, breathed forth in strains of sweet, simple, solemn music, the love of Christ was recognized, how I longed then to give utterance to what that love seemed to me. There was a moment in which the heavens seemed open to me, and I saw the glory of God! All the earth seemed to me a storehouse of images, made to set forth the Redeemer, and I could scarcely keep still from crying out. I never knew, I never dreamed before, of what heart there was in the word *Amen*. Every time it swelled forth and died away solemnly, not my lips, not my mind, but my whole being said—Saviour, so let it be."

And like this Puritan divine, many others, despite of their training and a different habit of worship, have felt themselves irresistibly drawn towards the Liturgy, and fascinated by the beauty and simplicity of its forms. The Rev. John Cumming, D.D., a Scottish Presbyterian, says: "I shall never forget how thrilling I felt one clause in the Liturgy. It is perhaps the first sentence and the sweetest prayer in the language: In all time of our tribulation; in all time of our prosperity; in the hour of death and in the day of judgment, Good Lord, deliver us."

Dr. Doddridge, the Presbyterian Commentator, says: "The language is so plain as to be level to the capacity of the meanest, and yet the sense is so noble, as to raise the capacity of the highest."

Watson, the author of the Theological Institutes, a Metho-

dist of high repute, exclaimed on the borders of the grave, and just before resigning his spirit into the hands of his blessed Redeemer—"Read the *Te Deum;* it seems to unite one in spirit, with the whole Catholic Church on earth and in heaven."

Richard Baxter sought the consolations of the English Liturgy in the hour of death, and it does not therefore excite our wonder that he should thus express himself,—"The constant disuse of forms is apt to breed giddiness in religion, and to make men hypocrites, who shall delude themselves with conceits that they delight in God, when it is but in those novelties and varieties of expression that they are delighted; and therefore I advise forms to fix Christians, and to make them sound."

The Rev. Flavel S. Mines, who was reared in the Presbyterian Church and ministered among that people, but afterwards became a minister of the Episcopal Church, says of the Book of Common Prayer,—"Like the Bible, it is a study for the learned, and yet giveth wisdom to the simple. Its language is, in part, literally the language of angels, and is yet within the comprehension of infants. It is a sun that will blind the gaze of the philosopher, but yet giveth light to the greatest and the least in the kingdom of heaven. It is an atmosphere full of wonders to the spiritual chemist, but feeding alike the life of the wise and the unwise. Its alleluiahs are the alleluiahs of the Cherubim and Seraphim; its hosannas, the hosannas in which babes and sucklings perfect and echo back the praise. We think with Robert Hall, that its simplicity is its majesty. All this we should not dare to say of a mere human composition. But the Liturgy is not a human composition; nineteen twentieths of its language are taken, line by line and word for word, from that volume which has the mysterious power to chain the understanding of a patriarch, and to charm the heart of a child. A Gabriel may desire to look into its pages; a Timothy may lisp them at his mother's knee."

All these testimonies will apply to the Order of Worship for the Reformed Church. For this contains all the forms upon which so much praise is bestowed, and deservedly so. We have not taken them from the Book of Common Prayer. They

were taken from liturgies which had been used for centuries and belonged to us as a denomination, by priority of claim, before the compilation of the English Liturgy by Cranmer and others, under the royal auspices of Edward VI. It is a well established historical fact, that theologians from the Continent, who did not recognize Episcopacy, had a hand in forming the Book of Common Prayer. The forms collected together in our Order of Worship, are the inheritance of the Christian past, and come down to us hoary with age, and venerable for the piety which breathes in every line—in every word. With all our heart we adopt the testimony which a mighty host of the most pious and devout men upon whom the Sun of Righteousness has risen with healing in his wings, since the days of the Apostles, have given utterance to, and which may be thus condensed: "Blame us not if we value our Liturgy; it embodies the anthems of Saints; it thrills the heart with the dying songs of the faithful; it is hallowed with the blood of the martyrs; it glows with sacred fire."

We have referred to the position, which the Reformed Church in the Palatinate occupied, in reference to the subject of liturgical worship immediately after the Reformation. No one fact in history is susceptible of stronger proof, than the use of precomposed forms of prayer in the Lord's Day service, both before and after the sermon, in the Church of the Heidelberg Catechism. No other public worship obtained for many—many years; and in the use of these liturgical forms, thousands and tens of thousands grew eminently ripe for heaven. And it was not until Puritanism proclaimed a *better mode!* of worshiping God, that the Reformed Church was drawn aside from the cultus of her founders, and fathers. She did not at once abandon the use of the Liturgy, in her transplantation to the New world. Only as a foreign and spiritualistic element infused itself, was she gradually drawn away from the "old paths," until at last the altar service was given up, and with it the ancient mode of praying to God and praising Him, as did the Church when Irenæus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Origen, and Tertullian, beheld the glory, and the noble army of her martyrs

died for her, as the spouse of Jesus Christ. As the departure from liturgical worship, and the introduction of extemporaneous prayers did not take place at once, but was the work of time, so her return to the time-honored forms of worship, which have fallen into disuse, and even into oblivion, must in the very nature of the case be gradual and by slow degrees. It is far easier in a case like this to retrograde than to advance and regain the lost position.

Though the Church in her German home was originally liturgical, and though it is felt and admitted by many of her sons, that her worship should resemble the worship, as it is carried forward in the heavenly sanctuary, as closely as the difference of circumstances will admit, yet we are not rashly to change the order of service to which the people are now accustomed. We are not, by any imprudence or misconduct on our part, to wound the body of Christ. It is not to be expected, that those who have all their life been taught to worship God in a free, extempore way, should submit to a strictly liturgical church-service without opposition. Habit soon becomes second nature. Prejudices once excited are hard to crush and remove. It is, therefore, necessary to move cautiously—to pursue such a course as will not rend the body of Christ, and jeopardize the interests of souls, for whom He died. In a matter of this kind, contemplating as it does an entire revolution in the devotional services, to which they have been accustomed from infancy, we must observe the cautionary precept of our blessed Saviour: "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves." The Apostle Paul lays down the principle by which we are to be governed in such matters: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." Prudence and a desire to promote, rather than retard the cause of Him, who has made us overseers of the flock committed to our care, forbid that we should do any thing calculated, as the forcible introduction of forms of prayer would be, "*to sin against the brethren and wound their weak conscience.*" To do so, regardless of the feelings of our members, hallowed and strengthened as they have been by many sacred associations, and happy hours spent in the sanctuary under the

form of worship, which for years has been universally prevalent in our churches, would be most assuredly to "*sin against Christ.*" Our solemn duty, under all the circumstances, is to pursue such a course for the attainment of the much desired end, as will not trample upon the feelings of those, who, with all their inability to see eye to eye with us in matters pertaining to the services of God's house, are as "dear to him as the apple of His eye, and are graven on the palms of His hands."

We may not impose the forms of the Order of Worship without the consent of the people. For this they must be prepared by cultivating in them a liturgical spirit. There must be in ordinary circumstances not only a taste, but an educated and cultivated taste, to appreciate beauty in a landscape, grace in a statue, refinement in manners, elegance in literature, force in eloquence, melody in music, purity in morals, and to come to the point in hand, perfection in worship. Time must be given, and proper efforts put forth to correct and adapt the taste. It is impossible to rise at a bound, or by a single effort to the dignity of a Liturgy, which to be adequately admired requires a spirit in sympathy with its forms, and an order of piety which finds its highest and happiest strains of devotion in its fixed channels. The people must be educated and prepared to regard forms of prayer in precisely the same light, in which they look upon familiar psalms and hymns, and good old tunes, such as Old Hundred, Wells, Saint Martin's, Mear, &c., of which the ear, the lips, and the heart never grow weary. There are times when those, who are most bitterly opposed to the "*everlasting repetition*," as it is termed, of the same words, acknowledge their force and their power in kindling devotion, and giving pinions to the affections and desires in their upward flight to the throne of grace. Some eight years ago, the Rev. Mr. Guinness, of England, visited this country, and electrified the people by his earnest, plain, and fervent style of preaching. He was called upon to preach to a congregation in Philadelphia, and when he entered the church, the choir executed an anthem which he regarded as altogether inappropriate to the time and the occasion. He rose, as soon as the

choir sat down, and stated: "I have come down here to-night to speak a few words with such as are anxious about the salvation of their souls; *that* which we have just heard was enough to drive away every solemn impression or serious thought." He then demanded that good, plain, old tunes should be sung, and hymns with which all were familiar, and at once gave out the beautiful hymn:

> "There is a fountain filled with blood,
> Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
> And sinners, plung'd beneath that flood
> Lose all their guilty stains."

Why is it that, in *protracted meetings*, recourse should be had to familiar hymns and tunes—that these should be sung for weeks and months together—and that every voice should join in the same words without growing weary, and the heart robbed of every devotional feeling by the *everlasting repetition?* Who does not know that a new tune or a new hymn daily resorted to for *variety*, would *kill a revival in one week?* Away, then, with the objection that forms impose too great a restraint upon a free spirit, and are fit only to be recited by the lukewarm and indifferent! The course pursued by those who denounce forms, conclusively shows, that the devotional feelings are best excited when, like the cries of Jesus in the garden, they are constantly "in the same words." If the same hymns and spiritual songs can be used again and again in praising God, why cannot the same forms be used again and again in praying to Him? Is it not preposterous in the extreme to make any distinction between prayer and praise? The one is not a whit more solemn than the other. The one does not require less care in the selection of suitable words to address the God, who has declared that He will not be mocked, and who abhors all idle words and vain repetitions, than the other. How strangely inconsistent to cavil at written forms of prayer, when they are largely made up of inspired language, and contain the devout breathings of holy men who lived centuries ago, and yet make use of prepared hymns in praising God, against the sentiments of some of which very serious objections could with propriety

be urged! Surely, if God loathes and detests a form in the one case, he must loathe and detest it in the other! What is true in praise holds equally good in prayer. It is the education of the people, that stands in the way of admitting this, and blinds their eyes to the excellency and power of the same words in prayer, pronounced with one heart and voice by the whole congregation.

Why is it, that we never grow weary of the forms of prayer, which we were taught to lisp at a fond mother's knee? Why is it, that familiarity in this case does not breed disgust, and their constant repetition become offensive and odious? It is related of that great statesman, John Quincy Adams, that he never retired to rest at night without repeating the verse taught him by his mother:

> "Now I lay me down to sleep,
> I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
> If I should die before I wake,
> I pray the Lord my soul to take."

As in praise, so in prayer, there are no words so full of sweetness and pious unction to the soul as those with which we are most familiar, and which have proved channels of devotion to myriads, who have exchanged the forms used in the temple below for the higher and more enrapturing forms of the temple above. Our spiritual necessities are always the same, and why should there be any necessity of invoking God in ever new and changing prayers? Let the pulpit speak out—give the people light—show them the inconsistency of using forms in praise, and clinging most tenaciously to hymns and tunes, with which they are most familiar, and the rejection of forms of prayer, as though *mutability* here were the very perfection of devotion. To do this may require much labor and patient perseverance. But though it may cost "line upon line, here a little and there a little," though it may be attended with no small amount of tribulation, this is the first thing that must be done. Without this cultivated taste, without a liturgical spirit, forms, could they even be imposed, would be of no value.

Upon the ministry this work devolves, and by a bold and fearless independence they can accomplish much. What the people want, and what they must have before there can be a setting up of the ancient landmarks, is *light*. Let the ministry speak out earnestly and candidly on the great question. If the educational influences, to which the members of our Reformed Zion have all their lives been subjected, constitute a barrier to the introduction of liturgical worship, then let every minister, who is not in heart opposed to it, do all in his power to prepare the way—to make rough places smooth and crooked things straight. Let the people be instructed as to the practice of Christ and His Apostles, the position of the primitive Christians, of the Catholic Church for sixteen centuries, and of the Reformers. Let this be done with resolution, and yet with all prudence, and the people will suffer themselves to be led step by step into the old paths. We have no faith in the driving process. And every effort to force the liturgy upon the people, *nolens volens*, will be indignantly repelled. Let then the pulpit spread before the people all the facts that have a bearing upon this question, and point out the advantages of liturgical worship over that which now prevails, and before many years, nay, in the case of many of our congregations, a very short time would suffice to open the way for the restoration of the primitive and ancient mode of *congregational* worship, in which all the people can "lift up their voice to God with one accord" along with the minister.

And until the way is fully open for this introduction of forms of prayer, and their stated and regular use by the people, until the system of praying by proxy is abandoned, and the privileges of lay-worship restored, let those who are called to lead the devotions of the sanctuary imitate the example of the Apostles in the use of precomposed and premeditated formularies. It is no easy matter to lead in public prayer with profit and edification. It is all-important when the minister takes his stand between God and his spiritual priesthood, to present unto Him their spiritual sacrifices, that he should do it in acceptable words. God says: "Be not rash with thy mouth and let not

thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore, let thy words be few." Does this look as if God sanctioned that kind of prayer, which is made up of words rising unadvisedly in the mind—which are the offspring of the moment—and which often convey ideas and principles as unfit for God to hear as for man to utter? And yet how many contemptuously sneer at all forms of prayer, and rush at a moment's warning into the dread presence of God, and pray as confidently as if they had premeditated for hours the most solemn performance in which we are ever employed! How often do such prayers, by their length and weariness, quench the spirit of devotion! Whitefield, after listening to such a prayer, once said: "Brother, you prayed me into a good frame, and you prayed me out of it again."

If we are not to preach to our fellow-men without previous preparation, then why pray to God without previous thought and reflection? Is previous thought necessary in our addresses to man, but wholly unnecessary in our supplications to God? When we come into the dread presence of God to be the mouth of His people, we should have a clear understanding of every word we are about to utter; every petition should have been previously framed and cautiously examined, so that we may utter nothing but what our heads approve and our hearts are desirous to adopt. We have no right to approach God with vain repetitions. It is our duty to come before Him with suitable preparation. And we should so lead the devotions, the formula should be such, that the people may understand the order or method to be pursued, and unite their hearts with us in adoration, confession, supplication, intercession and thanksgiving.

There are those who would lift up their hands in holy horror at the very idea of such preparation for public prayer as we now advocate. They would at once declaim with wonderful loquacity and *pious fervor* against all such forms. And yet, when you analyze the prayers of those who seem to be so terribly afraid of forms, what are they in reality but *forms?* With the speaker they may indeed be unpremeditated; but no

one can listen to them Sunday after Sunday, without hearing the same stereotyped expressions—in substance the same prayer, with but little variation. There is such a thing, then, as being unconsciously, but most slavishly bound to a form, and yet all the while be railing against forms. The truth is, there can be no public prayer without a form. The only question is as to the best form. The reading of prayers on every Lord's Day might not, where prejudices are strong and inveterate, be to edification. What we contend for is a thorough preparation for this duty. We are bound to prepare as fully for our approaches to God in solemn prayer, as we are bound to prepare for the instruction of the people in sound doctrine. Though many may cavil at forms, or worship Him with forms which they ignorantly persuade themselves are no forms, let us obey the command of God, who says: "*Take with you words.*" Let us seek to make ourselves as familiar with every petition of which our prayer is to be composed, as is the nature of the spiritual wants they are intended to supply.

But while we advise the use of precomposed and premeditated forms of prayer, so that all extravagances and improprieties of sentiment and language may be excluded which destroy the dignity, solemnity and fervor of public worship, the true idea of worship can never be fully realized so long as a whole congregation stand with sealed lips and listen to the minister confessing their sins, supplicating forgiveness, and invoking upon them the divine blessing. One of the great excellencies in prescribed forms of prayer is, that *they unite the congregation with the minister in the performance of the service.* In the mode of worship now so generally prevalent, the congregation do not audibly unite in the public service so much as even to say "Amen" to the prayers offered up in their behalf. The bright throngs in the heavenly sanctuary are not thus *silent.*

There, St. John tells us, the elders, and saints, and angels stand before the throne, and lift up their hearts and voices in *responsive* worship. One saint or angel is not represented as performing by proxy that which is the right and the privilege

of each and all the rest. How much more would the Church's worship on earth resemble that of the heavenly hosts, and how much more rational, interesting and edifying would such worship be, were minister and people to prostrate themselves before the throne of grace in contrite confession of their sins; were they unitedly to rehearse their belief in the great truths of their common salvation; were they to invoke by alternate supplications the Divine favor and blessing, and in responsive hymns recount the praises of their God and Saviour.

There are certain practices which we have approved and adopted, that cannot be supported with the same amount of scriptural evidence. I refer to the religious observance of the Lord's Day, that is, the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, enjoined in the Old Testament, and the giving of Holy Baptism to infants. How men can produce their authority for these practices by quoting the declarations of the fathers, and appealing to the custom of the early Church, and yet stultify themselves by opposing liturgical worship, which can produce in its favor not only the voice of the entire Church for centuries, but proofs *positive*, *direct*, and *incontrovertible*, from the New Testament, is passing strange! It would be interesting to pursue the line of argument adopted in defence of the observance of the Lord's Day and Infant Baptism, and show how powerfully and overwhelmingly the very same course of argumentation would plead for liturgical worship—for precomposed forms both in prayer and in praise. In some things men are faithful to the very letter in observing the injunction of the Apostle: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by *word* (of men) or our Epistle." But in other things, even the voice of Scripture and tradition combined, fails to produce conviction, and is set aside in favor of their own fancies and predilections. All this only shows how prejudice can blind and distort the mental vision, and how inconsistent men are, when a favorite opinion or theory of practice is to be established.

We long for the time when Christians shall earnestly inquire

for the *old paths*, that they may *walk* therein; when *with one accord* they shall exclaim:

> "Let names and sects and parties fall,
> And Jesus Christ be all in all;"

when, as in Apostolic days, there shall be "One Lord, one faith, one baptism;" when with "*one mind and one mouth*" all shall pray to God, as was done in that "upper room" in Jerusalem, where the infant Church engaged "with one accord in prayer and supplication." And now may the God of peace, through the all-prevailing intercession of our Mediator and Redeemer, vouchsafe to give unto His people everywhere unprejudiced minds, meek hearts, and devout affections, that in the public services of the sanctuary they may soon become as united in their prayers as they are in their praises—as symphonious and responsive as when they eternally join in adoration hereafter, and with ten thousand times ten thousand voices, like the noise of many waters, fill the courts of heaven with the song that is always new.

Art. VIII.—AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM MEETING IN FAITH.

BY DANIEL GANS, D.D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

Government, wherever you find it, is not from *man*, but from *God*—not from *beneath*, but from *above*, and always involves *divine*, and not human, authority. On this account the penalty which government inflicts through any one of its legitimate functionaries, is to be looked upon as a *divine* and not as a human chastisement. Whether, therefore, government come to us from abroad, or arise from within our own being, it is equally *from God*, and *therefore*, must be obeyed.

The object in this brief article, is to indicate the difference in the way of *Freedom*, as arising from our relation to government as now indicated—that is, to government as a power *outside* of us, and to government as a power *within* us.

In the first case, we have government as a commanding power speaking *to* man, forbidding this, and enjoining that. It has no respect to his feelings, his tastes or his inclinations. It simply *commands*, and the individual *must* obey.

Now it is clear, that all *such* obedience must, in the nature of the case, be more or less *unfree* and *slavish*, because the obedience may not result from an inward willingness or desire to obey. Indeed the outward command, it will be found most generally, if not always, regarding man purely in his natural state, is directly *against* the inward feeling to respond to it in the way of obedience. The command looks in one direction, while the individual will looks in another; and if the man obey at all, he does it because he *must*, or because he feels that he must, and not because it is his pleasure. As long as the government is purely external, there is no proper harmony between its authority on the one hand, and the spirit of man, on the other, which is expected and required to obey it.

On this account it is that the freest government in the world, whether in Church or State, must be more or less unfree and tyrannical. In this form it is always authority speaking *to* man, *demanding* obedience, while man does not find within him a disposition freely responding to it, but responding because it is a *command* and *must be obeyed.* This is the reason why, strictly speaking, there is no *free* government in the world. Approximations to this idea are all that we find, in fact. The free *disposition* to obedience is not *in* man, and hence, if obedience is to be secured at all, it must be *constrained* from without, which involves bondage for the spirit. Men, therefore, related thus externally to government, it matters not what kind or form it may be, are and must be always more or less unfree and slavish.

Here lies the conflict between the inward demand of freedom and outward or objective authority; and history shows that no wisdom of the Philosophers, or ingenuity of Statesmen has ever been able so to reconcile the two as to induce the sense of full liberty in the bosom of perfect obedience. Manifestly the difficulty lies not in government, or in the authority which

it represents, but in its subjects who are required practically to obey it.

Liberty is not secured by the destruction of objective authority; nor is it secured by educating the demand of freedom out of the spirit of man. This demand is inherent in man, and to remove it, by any means, is itself to degrade him to slavery; and on the other hand, to destroy outward authority, is to destroy all government, the first result of which would be anarchy, and the second bondage. It is not by the *destruction* of either of these constituent and necessary elements of man's life that liberty is attained; for in so doing, you will, and in both cases alike, reach at last the same end—*slavery*. A new force is required. Liberty lies in the *reconciliation*, not the destruction, of these two things. How this may be done is the great problem.

Now this problem, we say, can be solved only by the principle of faith. Faith does not deny government, but gives it an *internal* existence. It recognizes the same divine authority—"Seeing Him who is invisible." But in this case, the authority does not remain *outside* of the man, as something foreign to his will, commanding *this*, and prohibiting *that*. By faith this authority is introduced *into his inner being*, incorporated with the reason and conscience, and *identified* as it were with the substance of the will itself, making all his activities to arise in it, and go out from it. Thus, this authority becomes an essential part of man's own inward nature; it coalesces with his freedom; it is properly his own will; it speaks from his deepest consciousness; briefly, it is man himself, ruling himself in the fear of God.

Now this authority being thus *put into* man, and made identical with the law of his will, the conflict which ordinarily exists between it and the sense of freedom, is at once destroyed. This is the breaking down of the "partition-wall," by the atonement, (*at-one-ment*) of Christ, the substance of which faith involves as its contents. In the bosom of this divine grace, these two things are melted together; they flow into one and the same thing. It is freedom in law, or the will acting freely from its

own authority. This is the origin of *Peace*, involving the proper harmony of man's nature, and consequently the ground of true liberty. Divine grace, thus received by Faith, creates the internal disposition of obedience to authority; and in this disposition is involved the whole force or power practically of moral government. It changes the thoughts, desires and purposes of the mind, and unites them with the principle of right and law which these already comprehend as a necessary part of their being. Government is the same, but the subject is different. From this *new nature*, which starts from the principle of grace received by Faith, the man moves as naturally and freely in the *right* direction, as before this, from the life of his fallen and depraved nature, he moved in the *wrong* direction. He needs no force from abroad. This force which before was external, is now internal—which before was not part of him and simply spoke *to* him, is now identical with the deepest springs of his being, and speaks *from* the secret chambers of his own heart. "His *delight*, now, is in the *law* of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night."

Here Liberty and Authority are united in man very much as they are in God, and the problem is theoretically solved. Practically, however, man's ignorance, weakness and perverseness, will, of course, interrupt the actual harmony of these factors to some extent. The farther man advances in sanctification, the more perfect does his liberty become, simply because it brings him more and more into harmony with right law and the principle of objective authority. Sanctification has for its ultimate end the *perfect* blending of freedom and authority; and when this point shall be fully reached, liberty also shall be perfect and complete.

This is the government of *Faith*, which involves the only real Freedom known in the world. Hence our Lord said: "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free *indeed*." He is free in his obedience to law, because this law which he obeys is the central law of his own being. His obedience is made *necessary* not by anything outward, but by his freedom itself—it is the necessary outward expression of his soul liberated

from the law of sin, which is the law of rebellion against legitimate authority. His obedience is, therefore, not constrained or forced, but natural, spontaneous and joyous—it is the inward free *necessity* of his being.

This shows, now, still farther, that *liberty* and *necessity* are not *antagonizing* forces, but meet at last, and become the same thing. They are always one. In God this union is perfect; man is morally like God in proportion as he realizes the free union of the same forces in his moral constitution, resulting in *liberty*. The only possibility of realizing this is found in the atonement of Christ, which shows the deep and vital relation of Christianity to human society, if this can ever hope to realize the demand of its own being.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHURCH DOCTRINE, BIBLE TRUTH. By the *Rev. M. F. Sadler, A. M.*, &c. London: Bell & Daldy, 186 Fleet street. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. 1866.

This little book of 360 pages, from the book-store of J. B. Weldin & Co., 101 Wood street, Pittsburgh, Pa., has fallen into our hands, and deserves a notice in these pages. The author is known to some in the Church, from his little work on "The Second Adam and The New Birth," a review of which appears in the present number of this REVIEW. He has also published a larger work recently, entitled "Emmanuel," excellent also in its way, but not so satisfactory on the subject of the atonement as we expected. Not, that it is not strictly orthodox as to the *objective* character of the atonement, over against what may be called a merely *subjective* atonement, but because he does not attempt to give us the true reconciliation of these two sides, which, we think, the theological world is struggling after. Bushnell argues the problem with much earnestness, but falls short of a solution, taking his position in the view of the atonement being only subjective—only for man, and not also for God. The little work before us seems to be fully up to the author's other works. It treats the subject of the Church and Church Ordinances in the light of the Scripture. It is sometimes supposed, that churchly views must rest entirely upon tradition, while what is called *Evangelical Christianity* has the Bible all its own way. No greater mistake, however, could well be made than

this. It is always a begging the question when it is asserted, and isolated passages quoted to prove, that the modern Puritanic view of the Gospel is the Scriptural one. It makes all the difference in the world with what preconceived notions, or opinions, or faith we come to the study of the Scriptures. One may find (or think he finds) in the Epistles the modern metaphysical theory of election, according to Calvinism, while another reads there an altogether different scheme of election.

This little volume starts out by showing first what the *Gospel* is, viz.: *A setting forth of certain facts in the history of Jesus Christ.* Then he shows how effectually and scripturally the Gospel is set forth in the Church services for the Church year. The nature of the Church, the sacraments, ordinances, ministry, are then treated in the same way, that is, in the light of Scripture. All who read this book will be surprised to find how much the Scripture supports what may be regarded as the churchly over against the unchurchly system of faith and worship. Of course there are things in it in regard to the nature of the ministry which we cannot adopt; but we are taught that all things are ours, and whether the truth comes from Lutheran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, we all have a common inheritance in it. *It is ours.* A.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF EXODUS, WITH A NEW TRANSLATION. By *James G. Murphy, D. D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast.* Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: W. H. Halliday & Co., Nos. 58 and 60, Cornhill. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1868.

"The present volume on Exodus," says the author, in his preface, "is a second contribution" (the first was a commentary on Genesis) "to the exposition of the Old Testament, and to the practical demonstration, that a just interpretation of the volume of inspiration will obviate supposed difficulties, which have arisen mainly from misapprehension, and bring out more strikingly and uniformly its essential harmony with science, reason, and history. It removes, in the author's apprehension, any impossibilities that may have seemed to lie in the natural events that are recorded in the narrative."

"The method of exposition pursued in this volume, as well as in that of Genesis, is the following: First, the general arrangement and division of topics in the book are brought under notice. Next, at the head of each section, a few prominent words are quoted and briefly expounded, for the sake of readers acquainted with the Hebrew, who are supposed to peruse the section in the original. Then follows a translation of the section, which is designed to be a mere revision of the Authorized version. This the reader will compare with the original, or with the corresponding portion of his English Bible. The Commentary then appended is designed to explain the momentous import of the historical facts recorded, to mark their bearing on the

highest interests of man, and to unfold the great principles of ethical and theological truth which are stated for his guidance and comfort."

The work comprises a volume of 385 pages, published in the very best style. The first books of the Bible have become a subject of new interest in England, Ireland and Scotland, as well as elsewhere, by reason of the attack made upon their inspiration and credibility by Bishop Colenso.

The efforts to prove that science and revelation contradict each other have already proved to be a failure in reference to the divine record of creation. The more the subject is investigated, the more doubtless will it be found, that the researches of science only corroborate the whole record of the Pentateuch.

We always notice a striking difference, however, between English and German commentators. The former are mostly inclined to treat the inspired writings with a common-sense view of things, while the latter seem to bring to the work a deeper sense of the supernatural in revelation. This comes out in the author's treatment of the wonder-works of the magicians in Egypt. These present no real wonder to him; for they are explained on the common-sense theory, that the work of the magicians was merely a feat of legerdemain. The fact of a super-human evil world over against the supernatural in the Kingdom of God is not touched upon. This is only one instance in which the manner of treatment is shown. The Bible cannot be interpreted in its depths without a sense of the supernatural therein revealed. It is a mystery in language, as revelation itself is a mystery in fact.

Still the work is worthy of being commended as a useful volume, both for ministers and laymen. As a family commentary it will certainly serve a useful purpose. For professional study, it is not as rich and deep as others that might be named. The author has, however, faithfully carried out the promises of his preface. The New Translation is, doubtless, worthy the labor the author gave to it. A.

Goodrich's Pictoral History of the United States. Enlarged Edition. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1868. Pp. 516.

The merits of this educational work appear sufficiently in the fact that nearly 500,000 copies of it have been sold since its first publication about fifteen years ago. Though the design of the author was to make it originally a book for schools, it is believed, that as now presented, it will prove to be a convenient and useful manual for the family and the general reader. The author brings down the history of events in the United States to the Administration of President Johnson. The book is neatly printed on good white paper; 12mo., muslin; red edges. The illustrations are numerous and well-executed. K.

Mitchell's New School Geography. Published by E. H. Butler & Co., Philadelphia.

S. Augustus Mitchell has devoted his life to the study and elucidation of the Science of Geography. This is the fourth book of a

series of works in this department of learning. In it Prof. Mitchell furnishes us with a larger amount of information than we have met with in any similar work of the same size. His clear method and exact statement of the numerous and varied facts, which require mention in a work of this character, make it easy for the teacher to teach and for the pupil to learn and fix them in his memory. The book is already well known throughout this land, and deserves a place in the course of study of every school in the Union.

Accompanying this volume is an Atlas having forty-four copper-plate maps. It is no undue praise to say, that the care bestowed upon the literary, artistic and mechanical department of this Geography and Atlas make them in every way worthy of the advanced state of geographical knowledge and of popular education. The statistical tables and the pronouncing vocabulary of nearly 10,000 geographical words, appended to the Atlas, form a valuable feature of the series.

K.

MITCHELL'S NEW INTERMEDIATE GEOGRAPHY. By the same Publishers, is the third book of the author's series.

This is an entirely new work, and in its plan and general scope will be found well adapted to schools of every grade. After a definition of the terms used in Geography, the following order obtains. First comes the *map;* then, opposite, *the questions on the map;* and then, *the descriptive geography* of the countries which are on that map; with marginal questions on the descriptive matter. The position and extent of countries, their natural features, products, population, chief towns, government and religion, receive each proper attention at the hands of the author. The embellishments—numerous and well executed—are all that can be desired in a work of this kind. The works of Professor Mitchell *deserve* to be popular; and we are not at all surprised to find that they are used in whole or in part in thirty-five States of the Union. The Publishers have done their work well, and these truly useful books appear in letter-press that is refreshing to the eye. K.

THE AMERICAN CHILD'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By Samuel G. Goodrich. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co.

This book is designed to meet a demand which has long existed in our schools and in families. It is intended to serve as an introduction to the "Pictorial History" by the same author above noticed. It is a pleasure to examine the works of this famous author, who was so familiar to our childhood under the name of "Peter Parley." But he writes no more! This interesting book, written for children, is his last work! He knows right well how to talk to the little ones; and thousands of them will rejoice over this last production of an author, who thirty years ago taught and interested their parents by "Peter Parley's Tales." It is illustrated by sixty engravings. Neatly printed on clear white paper. K.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1868.

Art. I.—THE LATE EDITOR.

Rev. Henry Harbaugh, D.D., the late lamented Editor of the Mercersburg Review, died at his residence in Mercersburg on the 28th December, 1867, aged fifty years and two months. This sad event has already been announced, amid tokens of grief and sorrow, throughout the Church. Still, owing to the relation the deceased sustained to the Review, it is proper that it should be announced in these pages, accompanied with such poor words as we may be able to pen as a tribute to his memory.

At the request of the publishers, we superintended the getting up of the January number while Dr. Harbaugh was lying upon a bed of sickness. When the matter for that number was all sent in, we considered our work done. It was expected to be issued promptly on the first of the year, but some difficulty arising in arranging the forms, and the consequent necessity of procuring some new pages of matter, prevented its appearance until about a month later. Meantime Dr. Harbaugh was called away by death from his earthly labors. This will explain, what may have seemed strange to some, why no notice of his death appeared in the last number of the Review.

In accepting the editorship of the Mercersburg Review a little more than a year ago, Dr. Harbaugh brought to the work such reputation as a writer, and such interest in the system of philosophical and theological thought it was intended to represent, as gave assurance that its old reputation would be fully sustained. He had been a regular contributor to its pages from the commencement of its publication in 1849. At that time, when but *thirty-one* years of age, he had already published his first work, *The Sainted Dead*, a highly favorable notice of which appeared in the first volume of the Review. "Mr. Harbaugh," says the Reviewer, "is constitutionally a thinker, and not a mere dull retailer of other men's thoughts. The habits of the preacher and pastor, both vocations in which he is known to excel, are not allowed with him to mar the sympathies and affinities of the scholar; and the present production, in this view, is certainly very creditable to his literary character and powers, and carries in it also good augury for the time to come." This expectation was more than realized in his subsequent career.

His first article in the Review was on *Reverence in Worship*, in which may be discerned already the easy flow of his pen, his chaste style, as well as the deep, spiritual tendency of his thinking. From that time on, though not so frequently during the first years, probably because of his labors in preparing the second and third volumes of his work on *The Future State*, he appeared from time to time as a contributor, until the publication of the Review was suspended in 1861. These years cover a most important period in the history of the German Reformed Church in this country. Those who have lived through them in its communion, know something of the struggle through which the Church passed during this period, in maintaining its churchly position over against the unchurchly spirit that prevailed so generally in the American Protestant Churches. It was a struggle which seemed to test, for the theological thinking of the Reformed Church, to its utmost, the claims of Protestantism, in the midst of its rationalistic and disintegrating ten-

dencies then so powerfully active. Those who can sit down quietly and unconcerned, who can see even now no cause for serious concern in the present posture of the Church, who drink in and dole out theology as all settled and fixed for all time, who take their private judgment of the Bible as their infallible guide, who make no account of the Creed and the history of the Church in its formative, classic period, who in short do not believe in the Church as an objective order of grace, may wonder what all this struggle was about. Not so with the ministry of the Reformed Church. They made solemn earnest with the Church Question, and they came out of the struggle with a baptism as of fire, by which they became settled and confirmed in their faith in the one holy Catholic Church. Dr. Harbaugh continued during this period in full and hearty sympathy with the system of thought held and taught in our institutions at Mercersburg. It found a response in the depths and earnestness of his religious life. He grew with its growth, and thus became one of its ablest defenders.

Meantime he had gone forward in his career as an author. His three volumes on *The Future State* were followed from time to time by his Life of Schlatter, The Fathers of the Reformed Church, 2 vols., The True Glory of Woman, a volume of Poems, The Birds of the Bible, The Golden Censer, Union with the Church, a Child's Catechism, Hymns and Chants, Youth in Earnest, besides editing during all this time a monthly, The Guardian and contributing to various periodicals and Reviews. And all this, too, while attending to the onerous duties of a pastoral charge.

In the year 1863 he was called to the chair of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg. He returned to the institution in which he was educated enriched with valuable experience and varied learning. The energies of his active and laborious life were now concentrated in the new work to which he was called. Theology had been the study of his life, and theology, too, not in the old and worn-out moulds of thought, but as struggling after such new

enunciations as the progress of the Church demands. He seemed now to have settled down to the crowning work of his life. The theology which he had learned in early life from his venerable preceptor, Dr. Nevin, had become fully his own, and enriched by extensive reading and faithful study of German theologians. He now set about his new work with earnestness and industry. To systematize his own theological thinking, to travel over the whole field of theological science, to present each subject with that care and precision, the necessity of which only a teacher can realize, as he is confronted with earnest, intelligent, inquiring young men, whose preparation for the holy ministry he is to superintend, this was the great work to which he now devoted his time and energies. The extensive manuscripts he has left behind are witness of the unwearied faithfulness and diligence with which he prosecuted his labors. It may be interesting to his many friends to give a brief synopsis of these lectures. First, there is a full course of *lectures on Dogmatics.* This, of course, was the main, central study in his department. He had fully wrought out his own system, according to the Christological principle. Although he had selected *Lange* as his favorite author, yet his lectures give abundant evidence, that he did not rest satisfied with merely retailing other men's thoughts. During the last year of his residence at Mercersburg, he had commenced a careful review of these lectures, re-writing, modifying and improving. Judging from the work as far as thus completed, it is not too much to say that if he had lived to finish it, he would have produced a system of Christological Theology which would have gone far beyond any thing yet given to the public in this department in this country. The most difficult part of his work here consisted in settling upon his method, particularly with reference to the first part, the beginnings of any science, as all know, being by far the most difficult. The difficulty here was to make the Christological principle rule scientifically the very first inquiries in reference to the Being of God. This we think he did successfully. His system starts with the Consciousness of

God in man, which consciousness is of course in accordance with the image of God stamped in our being. It is a consciousness of God as He is related to man, and as He reveals Himself to man in the God-man. Thus we have the knowledge of God in Christ; or, we may say, The Father in the Creed is the Father in Christ—as Christ is the centre of the Creeds, so He is the centre of all theology. We give the headings of these opening lectures:

1. The Consciousness of God. 2. The Knowledge of God. 3. The Ground of the Knowledge of God. 4. The Development of the Consciousness of God. 5. The Genesis of the Knowledge of God. 6. The Eternal God-man. Then follows The Trinity, (a) Trinity in Unity, (b) Unity in Trinity (the ontological and economic Trinity), then The Essential Determinations in the Being of God (attributes), next Creation, The World as Cosmos, The World as Æon, &c., &c.

Next we have a course of Lectures on Practical Theology, on Catechetics, Cultus, and The Pastoral Work. Lectures on Homiletics, on Symbolics, on The History of Reformed Dogmatics, and on The Heidelberg Catechism. Of course but a poor idea can be conveyed by any such meagre outline, but it will suffice to show somewhat the amount of work performed. In a Seminary where the teaching is all done by two professors and a tutor, the wonder is where time could be found for such an amount of labor, amounting really to the preparation of full Treatises in the several departments above enumerated. The Church knows the labor he performed besides, preaching regularly in his turn in the Seminary Chapel, furnishing contributions regularly for the *Messenger*, serving on committees, &c., &c. No wonder his locks were rapidly turning white. Yet he was in the prime of life, full of youthful vigor, and prepared for many years of labor in the Church.

He seemed peculiarly fitted now for the work of editing the Review, which was called for from all quarters in the Church. His theological studies conducted him into the very centre of the sphere in which it proposed to move. Not for the purpose

merely of having a Quarterly to represent us as a Church among the theological Quarterlies, was the MERCERSBURG REVIEW called for, and its re-issue commenced. It was generally felt that it had a special mission to fulfill. The important problems growing out of the *Church Question*, which it had earnestly discussed years ago, were still waiting for solution. Interest in them was being revived outside our own denomination, and the times seemed propitious for presenting them anew to the consideration of the theological public. Our own ministry needed an organ for their theological interest and culture. Theology is discussed in other Quarterlies, ably and well, but not just after the manner in which the ministry in our Church are accustomed to discuss it.

Accordingly Dr. Harbaugh undertook the work of starting the REVIEW. It was to be a legitimate continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW, and accordingly it assumed the old familiar title, by which it had become known and endeared to us as a denomination. The old contributors came to its aid, among whom was one, whose name will suggest itself, whose contributions had given wide reputation to the old REVIEW, besides new ones of admitted ability; and it moved forward with the old tone and vigor, giving fair promise of a healthy life and a long and useful career. The first year of its publication came to a close, and on the last day of the year the mortal remains of its beloved and worthy editor were borne to the grave. His work on earth was done, and well done, and the Master called him to his reward.

A suitable record of the life and labors of Dr. Harbaugh has been presented elsewhere. We shall merely add to this brief sketch, some impressions which we have received from our intimate acquaintance and association with him, especially during the last few years of his life, which will doubtless meet a response in the minds and hearts of many others, who were attached to him in warm and devoted friendship.

The first feature of his life that rises up before us now is its *originality*. From beginning to end, it had peculiarly a type

of its own. This appears already in his first leaving the old homestead to seek his proper calling in life. His own nearest friends were not able, at the time, to understand why he should forsake the ordinary beaten track to seek some new career, and it was attributed to a changeable, wandering disposition, which would only end in disappointment. Perhaps his course was not clear in his own mind. He felt the stirrings of aspirations which only served at first to launch him out into the world. But, once started on the journey, these aspirations became clearer to his own consciousness, and it was not long before he earnestly set about preparing himself for that highest and holiest of all callings, the work of the Christian ministry. In a short time, by his own industry, he had prepared himself for a course of study in the College and Seminary, and now he returns from what was then called the West to the Institutions at Mercersburg, near his home, and enters upon the immediate preparation for the work of his life. Though starting with less than ordinary advantages of intellectual culture, he felt within him an impulse to a career which should be in no sense a mere copy of any other life. His sermons were always fresh and interesting, because they always presented some points or features which were original in the sense we have indicated. He became an author, and his books bore the same impress. He started a magazine, and infused into it his own peculiar life and spirit. He opened a career for himself, and pursued it with undeviating energy successfully to its goal.

Every one born into the world is endowed with the germ of an individuality, which is as unlike every other, as the expression of every one's countenance differs from every other in the world. Every individual, while he is an expression of the life of the race, is, in a deep sense, a new thought of God. Dr. Harbaugh was true to himself in this respect. In all his habits and manners he impressed those who came into his company with a sense of his naturalness. Of course, his more than ordinary talent, and varied attainments, gave strength and interest to this feature in his life, but there was something back of these,

which stamped every thing he uttered and did as peculiarly his own.

Call this originality, when thus strongly marked, genius, if you will. To it was owing largely the lasting impression which he has made upon the Church in which he labored, and the world of letters where he became extensively known. To it was owing likewise the warm bosom of friendship which he created wherever he became intimately known. His character in this respect was truly childlike, expressing in every word and act what he was. Life was too earnest and solemn, and his own individuality was too sacred, for him in any way to act merely a part. This may do for the stage, where characters change with the changing scenes; but it will not do for that life which is to be lived but once, whose issues are in the unchanging eternity.

He had a strong aversion and antipathy to any thing that looked like sham in any department of life. The readers of his magazine will recall the humorous severity with which he laid bare and rebuked, in a series of articles, a class of deceptions and impositions in the world, which have obtained the characteristic title, *humbug*. One of the greatest merits of the *Guardian* has been that it presents life to the young as real, presents it in its natural coloring, and dissipates that unreal and false coloring which is so generally thrown around it, especially by the light literature of our day.

This trait was marked also in Dr. Harbaugh's religious life. Here especially he felt that man ought to be true to himself. Religion is supernatural, but it is also natural. In each one it must speak in a natural voice which is true to the inward life. Hence religious cant was his aversion. An assumed tone or habit of piety called forth his strongest antipathy. He held it up often in the most withering exposure. For doing this, he was sometimes charged with making light of sacred things. It was his deep reverence for sacred things, for true piety, which led him to speak rebukingly of all kinds of sham in religion.

Another leading characteristic of Dr. Harbaugh was his

strong convictions and his strong faith. What to his mind and heart was true and right, drew out towards it his deepest sympathies, and that which stood arrayed against it called forth a deep-seated opposition. The question did not present itself so much in the sphere of intellect, a reasoning upon right and wrong, but it became to him a question of spirits, true or false, good or bad, and his deep-toned spiritual nature rose in hearty sympathy or hearty opposition. His nature has been truly characterized, in a beautiful tribute from a warm friend, in this respect, as being *ardent*. When he embraced a cause, he embraced it with his whole heart, and when he opposed a wrong, he set all the energies of his nature against it.

So, also, he had a calm, strong faith in the right, which gave a hopefulness to his disposition, and went far to infuse the same feeling in others. Of course all who believe in Christ and His religion, have faith also in its ultimate success and triumph; but how often the wisest and best are thrown into doubts and fears as to the immediate success of the truth in the world. And men of different temperaments are differently affected by the immediate prospects that present themselves to view. Few can resist the feeling of despondency, when unrighteousness triumphs and the cause of justice is trampled in the dust. Dr. Harbaugh was not an optimist. He did not sympathize with humanitarian views of the progress of society and the world. Success of the right, and progress in man's true interests, can only be reached in Christianity. The world rejects Christianity so far as it remains *this world*, and must move on in its own sphere to destruction. But in this perishing of the old, there arise continually new triumphs of the new life that has come into the world. To this Dr. Harbaugh hopefully looked, and while the struggle was going on, he was steadily looking for the victory. During the late war he was always hopeful while others desponded. When the enemy came in upon us like a flood, and men's hearts were failing them for fear, when Gen. Lee was leading his formidable hosts into the heart of Pennsylvania, when towns were thrown into panics, he met every ex-

pression of fear and doubt by the one question, "Have you heard from the Army of the Potomac? Wait till you hear where it is." In the struggles through which the Church is called to pass, he was calmly hopeful. Though the present might be dark with clouds and storms, he waited calmly for the coming sunshine. That must come after every storm, for storms are only temporary, but the sun shines ever. The gift of such a spirit in these times is of priceless value. In the tendencies of the times there is much to shake the faith of the wisest and best, not in the ultimate triumph of Christianity—that for the Christian is placed beyond all doubt—but in the success of particular forms of our common Christianity, in which we feel deeply interested. Such a form of Christianity is the divided condition of Protestantism. It must surmount its present weakness in some way, but how faint and few are the signs of the better state of *unity*.

What is true of Protestantism as a whole, that it is passing through a critical period of transition, is true also of particular denominations. These but reproduce the life and struggles of the whole. Hence in nearly every one of them may be witnessed counter tendencies struggling for the victory. Out of these sore travailings will come forth, in every one that is to be conserved, a true and safe deliverance from the bondage of sect and schism.

In the Reformed Church this struggle between counter tendencies has been felt for years, and is still going on. Dr. Harbaugh wielded a strong arm in support of the tendencies of a Catholic Christianity among us, and his strength rested in a strong conviction and faith, that in this struggle the old faith of the Creed will continue to stand against all its foes. He had strong confidence in the people of the Reformed Church. Their deepest religious instincts and tendencies, he believed, are of a churchly character. They may be confused and led astray for a time by another gospel, but when they see and understand the old, they will cling to it. How absurd, for instance, to expect that a German people, educated as ours have been, should re-

ject the conception of *sacramental grace*, give up the belief in a *tauf-gnade*, and embrace the Puritan scheme of the Gospel of Christ! This, Dr. Harbaugh strongly felt would be absurd, and therefore his conviction was strong that the people, the more they came to understand the issue, would rally to the churchly side in our present controversies. Only where they have become Puritanized can they lean to the other side. They are averse to changes because they love the old, and therefore they hesitate to endorse a change, even from a foreign order of worship which has imperceptibly stolen in upon us, to the old, but to be prepared for this they need only to learn that it is really a return to the ancient landmarks. That he interpreted rightly the religious instincts of our people, is made evident by the turn, which the question has taken at every critical juncture in our recent history. That he was right in his strong convictions on the subject of the Liturgy will, we believe, be fully shown by the future history of our Church. The people will not, in the end, sell their precious birthright for a foreign order of church-life and worship.

Dr. Harbaugh possessed, to a remarkable extent, what the Germans call Gemüthlichkeit—a word which it is difficult to translate. "Kindly disposition," "good nature," "heartiness," "tenderness of mind," all come short of expressing it fully. It was a quality in him which all could feel who became acquainted with him. It brought him very near to the hearts of his friends. It gave life and spirit to every circle which he entered. From this, too, flowed constantly a fund of rich humor. So deeply was this an element of his nature, that he carried it with him even through the days of his last protracted sickness. From his warm, hearty disposition, went forth a spiritual power which made sunshine in his sick chamber. His piety was of the deep, German type. It was never of the Puritan stamp. Never morose or gloomy, but always cheerful and hopeful. He greeted his friends who approached his bedside with the old familiar names, generally using the Christian name, as he gave them the warm grasp of his hand. Amidst

all the wanderings of his mind, his deep, German life and piety showed themselves to the last. By reason of the shadow that gradually gathered over his consciousness, through the affection of his brain, he could not clearly enunciate his feelings and convictions as he approached through much suffering the rest and peace of the heavenly world. His only desire to recover was that he might continue here to labor for the Church. Beyond this he had no wish to live. "No wonder," he said, on awaking once from what seemed an unconscious stupor, "that the early Church saw the blood of the atonement even on the leaves of the trees." At another time, when roused from such a state, he said to a friend, "They have called me back from the golden gates." During intervals of consciousness he spoke with calmness of his approaching end. Not many days before his death he remarked to the young friend who nursed him, "Some of these afternoons I will take my departure." When asked what he meant, he explained, that he would depart to the other world. His words were fulfilled. On an afternoon, the last of the week, as the day began to merge into the shades of evening, he peacefully slept in Jesus. It was the good man's Saturday night. The weary work of life was done, the toil was ended, and he rested from his labors to enter upon the enjoyment of the eternal Sabbath.

During the last few years of Dr. Harbaugh's life, we lived in the most intimate friendship and almost daily intercourse with him. We knew and sympathized with his views and aims in starting the REVIEW. We know the contributors to whom he looked for articles, and merely applied to them in filling out for him the work of the first year. And now, called unexpectedly to continue this work for another year, we propose to do what we can to advance the important interest with which we have been brought into this more intimate relation.

Under such circumstances, no lengthy introduction seems to be called for at our hands, in assuming for the present the edi-

torial management of the REVIEW. A single year could hardly be expected to produce much change in the general purposes it seeks to subserve. And yet that brief period has served, to no inconsiderable extent, to reveal more clearly and fully the important mission upon which it has entered. It is idle to attempt to conceal the fact, that our Protestant Christianity is engaged in a struggle, which vitally concerns its very existence. The strife is not about mere words, but in reference to the very essence of Christianity. Is it, or is it not, a real supernatural order of grace and heavenly powers in the world? Does it reach down in unbroken succession from the historical Christ and His Apostles, in a truly historical form, with an objective constitution of its own in the Holy Catholic Church, and as such challenge the faith and submission of men? Or is it mere subjective experience, a matter of private interest between each man and his Maker?

It is not difficult to see that the call of Protestantism is something more than merely to confront and expose the errors of Rome. If it is to stand, it must make good its claims to being a positive power, over against the new assaults of rationalism and infidelity which are directed against it. These assaults are made under more specious and dangerous forms than ever confronted the Church before, in proportion as the powers of darkness develop towards their final doom. And it cannot be concealed either, that the most dangerous foe of the Church is precisely that which rises in her own bosom. The anti-Christ ever seeks to stand in the temple of God, to be worshipped as God. Hence the disposition in our day to array Christianity against itself. The struggle is mainly within our own camp. Men seek to array the mystical Christ against the historical Christ. The historical Christ is made to be a myth, under the plea of honoring the Christ who is mystically, or ideally only, present in the minds and hearts of men. Thus would such men as Straus and Renàn undermine the historical foundations of Christianity, in order to place before us a phantom for our Lord and King.

Over against all such assaults of rationalism, it remains for

Protestantism, as the purest and best form of Christianity in the world, to make good its claims upon the faith and obedience of men. What are its provisions and preparations to do this? The endless diversity of its creeds and forms of organization is at once a confession of its weakness. This is coming to be felt more and more year by year. It is no longer considered an advantage that the Protestant Church is unable to present a united front to the assaults of its enemies. Churches are casting about for plans of union. They are seeking, often blindly it is true, for a centre of unity. The movements in this direction during the past year are ominous. They reveal a growing sense of weakness, while at the same time but little has been gained of a really substantial character to satisfy this want. But even this sense of want may be taken as one of the hopeful signs of the times.

The Mercersburg Review has a word to utter on the issues thus more and more clearly confronting the Protestant Church. It seeks to labor earnestly for Protestantism, with full faith in its divine call and mission, but with a lively sense also of its weaknesses, imperfections, and dangers.

During the last year there has also been developed more fully a contest within the bosom of our own denomination, corresponding in many of its features with the strife between genuine and spurious Protestantism without. The Review aims to be the *organ*, not of a party or a school, as is sometimes charged against it, but *of the Church*. It plants itself firmly, first of all, upon the Apostles' Creed, and seeks to interpret and measure modern confessions by that symbol. In this full justice is done to the Reformers, and the great interest of the Reformation. The Reformation never professed nor pretended to be of like authority with the Apostolic Church, whose faith came to its catholic expression in the Apostles' Creed. The Reformers never designed to set aside the proper authority of the Creed and the early Church. To these they constantly appealed, and, as in the case of the Heidelberg Catechism, they made the

Creed to be still the authoritative expression of our Catholic Christian faith.

The Reformation comes before us thus as a most important epoch indeed, but not of like authority with the Apostolic Church, nor one that in any way sets aside the meaning and authority of that period which immediately succeeded the Apostolic times. As Protestants we have a patrimony in Early Christianity. We also must use the freedom guaranteed us by the Reformation itself, to strive after a higher and better position than we now occupy. The Reformers can never become our popes. The three centuries which have unfolded the contents of the Reformation must form the womb for the birth of a new epoch. To the dawn of a new era, all who make earnest with the present struggles in the Church look with faith and hope.

It only remains to add, that in assuming the editorial management of the REVIEW, we expect to serve those who are especially interested in its publication to the best of our ability. We look confidently to its friends for hearty support. It is to be seen whether the Church will sustain it in such a way as to guarantee its permanent success.

ART. II.—HOLY BAPTISM.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

BY E. V. GERHART, D. D., LANCASTER, PA.

We propose to institute an inquiry into the doctrine concerning Holy Baptism as held and taught by the Reformed Church.

We do not mean the Reformed Church of Germany, or the German Reformed Church, particularly. Nor do we mean the doctrine of the entire Protestant Church, which would include Lutheranism. We intend to limit our inquiry to the Reformed branch of Protestantism. Within this limit, however, we propose to survey the whole field; which will embrace the Reformed Church of Switzerland, of France, of Germany, of Holland, of Belgium, of Bohemia, of Poland, of England or the Anglican Church, and the Reformed Church of Scotland, or the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and Ireland, and its various subdivisions in America.

To determine this question in a satisfactory manner, it is necessary to go to the most trustworthy sources of information. These may be divided into three classes: 1. The works of the leading theological Professors and divines of the different branches of the Reformed Church, who are to be regarded as the representatives of the Reformation period, and the exponents of the Reformed faith; 2, the various Liturgies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and 3, the numerous Confessions of Faith and catechisms of the Reformed Church.

An examination of all these sources would be necessary in order to furnish the evidence in full concerning the Reformed Doctrine; but this would make a series of articles or a book,

instead of one article of ordinary length. We will therefore waive, for the present at least, an examination of the first two sources, and confine our attention chiefly to the third, which, taken by itself, is the most important. The Catechisms and Confessions contain the most direct and positive expression of the Reformed faith. Though the language is here and there affected and modified by reference to the errors of Romanism on the one side, and of Rationalism, Anabaptism and Infidelity on the other, and must in all such cases, be interpreted in the light of the prevailing issues, yet it is thus affected and modified in a much less degree than the writings of theologians and divines, which are to a large extent of a controversial character. This is true especially of the doctrine of Baptism. On no doctrine is the language of the Catechisms and Confessions, taken together, more clear, consistent and unequivocal. And when particular forms of expression involve a reference to questions of the age, it happens that the language presents no difficulty, but is intelligible both to clergymen and laymen; for the many questions at issue then concerning the nature and efficacy of Baptism, are the very questions which are at issue now, and with which every intelligent Christian is conversant.

The principal and most important aspect of the question at issue now in the Reformed Church of America, including the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches, is whether Holy Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration? Has Christ ordained this Sacrament for the remission of sins, and the communication of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost? Is it the act of God, in which he translates the subject from the state of nature into the state of grace, from the kingdom of the Devil into the kingdom of Christ? Does a person, who is a child of the Devil through the fall of Adam and the inheritance of original sin, become, by Baptism, a member of the mystical body of Christ and thereby a child of God? These several questions are but different forms of presenting one general question, namely: Does Baptism take away the guilt and pollution of sin and communicate the new life of the Spirit in Christ Jesus?

We answer in the affirmative; and maintain that the doctrine we hold concerning the objective, saving efficacy of this Sacrament is the true Protestant and Reformed doctrine. Our opponents, comprising four-fifths, if not nine-tenths, of the ministry and laity belonging to the Reformed family of Churches, answer in the negative, and maintain that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is neither Reformed nor Protestant, but Romish.

This is one of the very questions that agitated the Reformed Church during the period of its organization; and in consequence the language of the Confessions in which the rationalistic errors of the sixteenth century are condemned and the positive truth taught, is as well adapted to the religious and theological mind of our day, as if these Confessions had been drawn up expressly for the purpose of lifting up a standard against the insidious unbelief of the nineteenth century.

CONFESSIONS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

With the view accordingly of ascertaining what the Reformed doctrine on the subject of Baptism is, we proceed to examine the following Confessions and Catechisms: The Augsburg Confession; the Tetrapolitan Confession; the First Basel Confession; the Confession of Bohemia; the Second Basel or Former Helvetic Confession; Calvin's Catechism; the Gallican Confession; the Confession of Scotland; the Confession of England; the Belgic Confession; the Heidelberg Catechism; the Latter Helvetic Confession; the Confession of Sigismund; the Confession of Poland; the Westminister Confession, and the Larger Catechism.

The *Augsburg Confession*, drawn up by Melancthon, was, at the instance of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, presented to the Diet of Augsburg, by the most renowned Princes of Germany and other States of the Empire, in June 1530, and although claimed as the first symbol of the Lutheran Church, must be regarded as the first Confession of the Protestant Reformation, made before the Reformed and Lutheran tendencies had developed themselves into division and separation. It is a formal expression of the Reformed faith, as it stood at that time, no less than of the Lutheran faith, and ought therefore to be consulted

on the subject of Baptism, in order to get a complete view of the Reformed doctrine. The Augsburg Confession, because of this relation which it bears to the first period of Protestantism, is included by *Mess* in his *Sammlung symbolischer Bücher der Reformirten Kirche*, published in 1828.

The *Tetrapolitan Confession*, composed mainly by Bucer, was presented by the deputies from the four free cities, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau, to the Emperor at the same diet of Augsburg in 1530; these cities being unwilling to subscribe the Confession drawn up by Melancthon. It was designed to be both a positive statement of the Reformed faith and a vindication of themselves against the charge, that they had departed from the truth as taught by the Word of God. Like the Augsburg Confession, it was delivered in both the Latin and German language.

The *First Confession of Basel*, sometimes called the Confession of Mühlhausen, was, according to what we regard as the best authorities, composed in the German language about the year 1532. There are those who hold it to be coeval with the Augsburg Confession, the Tetrapolitan Confession and Zwingli's Exposition of Faith. The author is not certainly known. Some suppose it to have been the production of Oecolampadius, revised and improved by his successor Oswald Myconius. Subscribed by the ministers of Basel, it was first published in 1534. Then again in the year 1561, it was both recognised and received by the same ministers of Basel. It passed through many editions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and acquired great reputation and great influence as a Reformed Confession.

Following the order of time we cite next the *Confession of Bohemia*, which dates back to 1535, when it was first published in the vernacular tongue, and submitted to the king, Ferdinand, as containing the faith of the barons and nobles of the kingdom. It received the approval, as appears from the preface, of Luther, Melancthon, and other divines of Wittemberg.

Bohemia had numerous confessions, which, though the same essentially, vary from each other in the order of topics and in

forms of expression. Of these, according to Niemeyer, two are especially worthy of regard. To both of these he has given a place in his *Collection of Reformed Confessions.* The one is a revision of the Confession of 1535, and published in 1573, in Latin and German.

Of this the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions*, first published in Latin at Geneva, in 1581; then in English at Cambridge, 1586; and recently edited by the Rev. Peter Hall, M. A., London, 1842, says: "The Confession of Bohemia, being the last-composed of four former, which were far more ancient, being recited in the same order of chapters and arguments, and somewhat more plainly expressed, and in the year 1573, published in divers places, was also approved by common testimony of the University of Wirtemberg; even as Masters Luther and Melancthon had approved the former, published in the year 1532, being altogether the same in doctrine with this, as Luther his Preface witnesseth. And we called it elsewhere the Confession of the Waldenses, following the common title assigned unto these churches."

The Second Confession of Basel, more commonly known as the *Former Helvetic Confession*, was written by Bullinger, Myconius and Grynaeus in 1536, under appointment of an ecclesiastical convention which had assembled for this purpose at Basel in the name of the different Protestant cantons of Switzerland. By the same authority it was afterwards ratified and published. It was submitted to the assembly of divines at Wirtemberg by Bucer and Capito. The year following,1537, it was again submitted by Bucer, accompanied with an exposition, to the assembly of Smalcald, and approved by the whole assembly, as appears from Luther's letters to the Swiss.

The *Genevan Catechism* was first written in 1536, in French, by John Calvin for the use of the church of Geneva, but afterwards, at the instance of the ministers of Geneva, it was modified and enlarged, and published at Basel in Latin, in the year 1538.

The *Gallican Confession*, or the Confession of France, was first presented in French, in the year 1559, to Francis the

Second, King of France, at Amboise, in behalf of all the godly of that kingdom; again, in the year 1561, at Poissy, to Charles the Ninth; and at length also published in Latin by the pastors of the French churches, with a Preface addressed to all other evangelical pastors, in the year 1566.

The *Confession of Scotland* was first exhibited to, and allowed by, the three estates in Parliament, at Edinburgh, in the year 1560; again ratified at the same place, and by the same autho rity in 1567; and finally subscribed by his Majesty the King, and his household, at Holyrood House, January 28th, 1581. Written originally in the Scotch language, it was first published in 1568. It was subsequently translated into Latin, and published in 1612.

The principal *Anglican Confessions* are the Forty-two Articles of king Edward VI., drawn up and adopted by a Synod convened at London in the year 1552, and first published in London and Zurich in 1553; and the Thirty-nine Articles, the result of a revision of the Forty-two Articles, by the Synod of London, convened by authority of Queen Elizabeth, in the year 1562; the latter established by the solemn sanction of the State and the Church, being the recognized formula of faith which has prevailed in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, down to the present day.

The *Confession of Belgium* was drawn up in 1561 or 1562, when Philip II. was about introducing the inquisition into the Netherlands for the suppression of the Reformed faith, with the view of averting the impending persecution. It was published in French, in the name of all the churches of Belgium, in the year 1556. In the year 1579 it was translated into the Belgian tongue, and in the public Synod of Belgium was repeated and confirmed.

The *Heidelberg or Palatinate Catechism*, written in German by Zacharias Ursinus and Casper Olevianus, under authority and by direction of Frederick III, Elector of the Palatinate, was laid before a Synod composed of representatives of the churches of his dominions, and unanimously adopted, January 1563. It was published in the same year both in German and Latin.

The *Latter Helvetic Confession* was written in Latin by Henry Bullinger, in 1562. At the instance of Frederick the Third, Elector of the Palatinate, it was translated into the German language, and published in 1566, in order to vindicate the faith of the Reformed Churches against the aspersions of the Lutherans. It was approved and subscribed not only by the ministers of Zurich, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangallia, Rhetia, Mühlhausen and Bienne; but also by the churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary and of Scotland. In the course of time it came to be known and regarded as the proper Swiss Confession.

John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, 1608–1619, provoked by the bitter hostility of the Lutherans to the Reformed to examine the doctrines of the Reformed Church, was constrained to embrace the Reformed faith, and passed over from the Lutheran to the Reformed communion formally, by celebrating the Lord's Supper according to the Reformed cultus, in 1613. This transition led to the preparation of a *Confession of Faith*, which was published in May, 1614.

The Confession of Poland is the Confession submitted by the Reformed theologians to the *Colloquium* at Thorn, in 1645, held at the instance and by the authority of Wladislaus, IV. King of Poland, 1632–1648, for the purpose of abating the fierce dissensions which prevailed among the Roman Catholics, Reformed and Lutherans in his kingdom, and bore the title: "Declaratio doctrinæ ecclesiarum Reformatorum catholicæ." It soon acquired authority as a Confession of the Reformed Church, though of secondary importance.

The *Confession of Faith*, and the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*, of the Presbyterian Church are the work of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which, in the reign of Charles I., was convened by act of the Long Parliament, for the purpose of "settling the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." The Assembly met in the chapel of Henry VII., July 1st, 1643, and continued its sessions nearly five years, until Feb. 22d, 1648.

Though the immediate and specific design of the Westminster Assembly was not accomplished, as the political reaction and the restoration brought back with it the polity and cultus of the Episcopal Church, yet the work it performed has proven itself to be of vast significance. Whilst the Westminster Confession and Catechisms failed to become the faith of the Church of England, they were cordially adopted by the Reformed Church of Scotland, and have been held as the authoritative formularies of Christian doctrine in Scotland, Ireland and America, by all branches of the Presbyterian Church, for more than two centuries. And the Directory which the Assembly prepared has regulated and moulded Presbyterian worship, the worship of all the English Calvinistic Churches, and even supplanted, in great measure, the Palatinate Liturgy in the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches of America.

Of these fifteen Confessions of the Reformed Church, of which we have now given a brief historical notice, there are six which possess primary and general authority, being by universal acknowledgment the true exponents of the Reformed faith as it stood in the sixteenth century. These are the Former and Latter *Helvetic* Confessions, the *Gallican*, *Scotch* and *Belgic* Confessions, and the *Heidelberg Catechism*. With these symbolical books the *Confession of Faith* of the Westminster Assembly and the *Larger Catechism* take rank as authoritative exponents of the faith of the Puritan branch of the Reformed Church as it prevailed in the century following. The other Confessions hold a secondary and subordinate position; not because they fail to be in full harmony with those acknowledged authorities, but because, owing to their form, design and local relations, their influence was more limited and less powerful. But we will examine them also, in order to show that the Reformed doctrine of Baptism was one and the same in all countries where the Reformed Church obtained a foothold.

As the Decrees of the National Synod of the Reformed Belgic Churches, assembled at Dort in 1618 and 1619, are limited to the celebrated Five Points of Calvinism,—divine predestination, redemption by the death of Christ, natural depravity, conver-

sion, and final perseverance,—they do not come under review in the examination of the question we have in hand.

REFORMED DOCTRINE OF A SACRAMENT.

The doctrine of Holy Baptism is rooted in the more general doctrine concerning a Sacrament. The nature of a Sacrament is the general nature of Baptism. Therefore, before we proceed to quote and examine the teachings of the Confessions on the particular question before us, we will first inquire into the Reformed idea of a Sacrament. The general being the basis of the particular, a correct apprehension of the one will qualify us to institute an intelligent inquiry into the other.

According to the idea universally prevalent among the Reformed Churches in all countries during the sixteenth century, a Sacrament is the visible *sign* of a present invisible grace. The visible sign is the natural element; in the Eucharist, bread and wine; in Baptism, water. The invisible grace is the spiritual gift of God. In Baptism, the gift is the presence and effective operation of the blood and Spirit of Christ; in the Eucharist, it is the nourishment of the believer unto everlasting life by the communication of the body and blood, or the glorified human nature, of Christ. The Sacrament is not an empty sign, not the natural element by itself. Nor is it the abstract grace of God; grace apart from the natural element. But a Sacrament is the institution of Christ in which the two things, the natural element and the spiritual gift, are one. They are not identical. The natural element is not transmuted into the spiritual gift; so that the natural element is only such in appearance, and not in reality. But the natural element remains what it was before it was made an essential part of the sacrament; water continues to be real natural water; bread and wine continue to be real, natural bread and wine. But the spiritual gift is joined to the natural element by the power of the Holy Ghost; and this union of the visible natural and the invisible spiritual in the institution, constitutes the Sacrament. In the absence of either, the Sacrament does not exist. Were the invisible grace not present in the administration, the natural

element, for want of the thing signified, would not be a sign. Were the natural element annihilated by transmutation into the invisible grace, this present grace, for want of the external sign, would not be the thing signified. Either form of error destroys the Reformed idea of a Sacrament.

In virtue of the union of the natural and spiritual in the Sacrament, the natural element certifies the presence of the spiritual gift for the purpose of salvation. It is thus a *seal* no less than a sign. The sign makes certain to faith the real presence of what is signified. It cannot certify the presence of what it does not signify. In Baptism, the water does not signify the penitence and faith of the subject, and therefore does not certify the genuineness of his personal experience. But it signifies the efficacious operation of the blood and Spirit of Christ. This grace being as truly present as the water, the administration of the Sacrament by the application of water in the name of the holy Trinity, certifies the invisible or spiritual work to be as real as the external transaction. In the holy Eucharist the bread and the cup do not signify the moral and spiritual fitness of the communicant, and therefore they do not certify his conversion and sanctification. But these signs certify the presence of the divine-human Christ as the true spiritual food of the believer. Christ Himself being thus as truly present as the bread and the cup, the communication of these elements by the minister certifies the communion of Christ with the believer to be as real as the outward eating and drinking.

The Sacrament being the visible sign of present invisible grace, it assures the believer of the reality of the divine act. The idea of sign involves the idea of seal. Were the Sacrament not a seal, it would not be a sign. As the sign is objective, so is the seal. Both pertain, not to men, not to personal experience, but to the Person and work of Christ as connected by the power of the Holy Ghost with the natural element. Thus the Reformed idea of sign completes itself in the idea of seal.

We have now presented, in our own language, the Reformed

idea of a Sacrament, as drawn from the Reformed confessions. Let us in the next place examine the authorities themselves.

The Latter Helvetic Confession says: "Sacraments are mystical symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions, ordained of God Himself, consisting of His Word, of outward signs, and of things signified; whereby He keepeth in continual memory, and oft-times recalleth to mind, in His Church, His great benefits bestowed upon man; and whereby He sealeth up His promises and outwardly representeth, and, as it were, offereth unto our sight those things which inwardly He performeth unto us, and therewithal strengtheneth and increaseth our faith through the working of God's Spirit in our hearts."

"The principal thing, which in all the Sacraments is offered of the Lord, and chiefly regarded of the godly of all ages, which some have called the substance and matter of the Sacraments, is Christ our Saviour; that only sacrifice, Heb. x. 12, and that Lamb of God slain from the beginning of the world, Rev. xiii. 8."

"And as in the Old Church the Sacraments consisted of the Word, the sign, and the thing signified, so even at this day they are composed, as it were, of the same parts. For the Word of God maketh them Sacraments, which before were none; for they are consecrated by the Word and declared to be sanctified by Him who first ordained them. To sanctify or consecrate a thing, is to dedicate it unto God, and unto holy uses; that is, to take it from the common and ordinary use, and to appoint it to some holy use. For the signs that be in Sacraments are drawn from common use, things external and visible. As in Baptism; the outward sign is the element of water, and that visible washing which is done by the Minister. But the thing signified is regeneration, and the cleansing from sins. Likewise, in the Lord's Supper; the outward sign is bread and wine, taken from things commonly used for meat and drink. But the thing signified is the body of Christ which was given, and His blood which was shed for us, and the communion of the body and blood of the Lord. Wherefore the water, bread and wine, considered in their own nature, and out of this holy use

and institution of the Lord, are only that which they are called, and which we find them to be. But let the Word of God be added to them, together with invocation upon his Holy Name, and the renewing of their first institution and sanctification, then these signs are consecrated and declared to be sanctified by Christ. For Christ's first institution and consecration of the Sacraments standeth yet in force in the Church of God, in such sort, that they which celebrate the Sacraments no otherwise than the Son Himself from the beginning hath appointed, have still even to this day, the use and benefit of that first and most excellent consecration. And for this cause, in the administration of the Sacraments, the very words of Christ are repeated. And forasmuch as we learn out of the Word of God, that these signs were appointed unto another end and use than commonly they are used unto, therefore we teach that they now, in their holy use, do take upon them the names of things signified, and are not still called bare water, bread, or wine; but that the water is called *regeneration* and *bath of the new birth;* and the bread and wine *the body and blood of the Lord*, or the pledges and Sacraments of His body and blood. Tit. iii. 5. 1 Cor. x. 16. Not that the signs are turned into the things signified, or cease to be that which in their own nature they are, for then they could not be Sacraments, which would consist only of the thing signified and have no signs; but therefore do the signs bear the names of the things, because they be mystical tokens of holy things, and because the signs and the things signified are sacramentally joined together; joined together, I say, or united by a mystical signification, and by the purpose and will of Him who first instituted them. For the water, bread, and wine, are not common, but holy signs. And He that instituted water in Baptism did not institute it with that mind and purpose, that the faithful should only be dipped in the water of Baptism; and He who commanded the bread to be eaten and the wine to be drunk in the Supper, did not mean that the faithful should only receive bread and wine, without any further mystery, as they eat bread at home in their houses; but that they should spiritually be partakers of the things sig-

nified, and by faith be truly purged from their sins, and be partakers of Christ."*

We deem it scarcely necessary to follow this statement with any extended quotations from other Reformed Confessions, as it teaches the doctrine in question clearly and forcibly, both in a positive and in a negative form. It teaches what a Sacrament is in direct terms, and denies the errors with which the

---

* As the Swiss Confessions may not be accessible to many of our readers, and as this passage is perspicuous, comprehensive and very important in its relation to the doctrine of the Sacraments as taught in later Confessions and received in all the Reformed Churches, we subjoin the original text:

"Sicut autem quondam Sacramenta constabant verbo, signo et re significata, ita nunc quoque iisdem veluti partibus absolvuntur. Nam verbo Dei fiunt, quæ antea non fuerunt, Sacramenta. Consecrantur enim verbo, et sanctificata esse ostenduntur ab eo qui instituit. Et sanctificare vel consecrare, est rem aliquam Deo sacrisque usibus dedicare, hoc est, a communi vel profano usu segregare et sacro usui destinare. Sunt enim in Sacramentis signa petita ex usu vulgari, res externæ et visibiles. In baptismo enim, signum est elementum aquæ, ablutioque illa visibilis, quæ fit per ministrum. Res autem significata, est regeneratio vel ablutio a peccatis. In cœna vero Domini, signum est panis et vinum, sumptum ex communi usu cibi et potus. Res autem significata, est ipsum traditum Domini corpus, et sanguis ejus effusus pro nobis, vel communio corporis et sanguinis Domini. Proiude aqua, panis et vinum sua natura, et extra institutionem divinam, ac usum sanctum, duntaxat id sunt, quod esse dicuntur, et experimur. Cæterum, si accedat Domini verbum, cum invocatione divini nominis, et renovatione primæ institutionis et sanctificationis, signa ista consecrantur, et sanctificata a Christo esse ostenduntur. Manet enim semper efficax in ecclesia Dei prima Christi institutio et consecratio sacramentorum, adeo ut qui non aliter celebrent Sacramenta, quam ipse Dominus ab initio instituit, fruantur etiam nunc prima illa consecratione omnium præstantissima. Et idio recitantur in celebratione sacramentorum ipsa verba Christi. Et quoniam verbo Dei discimus, quod signa haec in alium finem sint instituta a Domino, quam usurpentur vulgo, ideo docemus signa nunc in usu sacro, usurpare rerum signatarum vocabula, nec appellari amplius aquam tantum, panem et vinum, sed etiam regenerationem vel lavacrum renovationis, item corpus et sanguinem Domini, vel symbola aut Sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Domini. Non quod symbola mutentur in res significatas, et desinant esse id quod sunt sua natura. Alioqui enim Sacramenta non essent, quæ re significata duntaxat constarent, signa non essent; sed ideo usurpant signa rerum nomnia, quod rerum sacrarum sunt symbola mystica, et signa et res significatæ, inter se sacramentaliter conjungantur, conjungantur inquam, vel uniantur per significationem mysticam, et voluntatem vel consilium ejus, qui Sacramenta instituit. Non enim aqua, panis et vinum, sunt signa vulgaria, sed sacra. Et qui instituit aquam baptismi, non ea voluntate consilioque instituit, ut fideles aqua duntaxat baptismi perfundantur: et qui jussit in Cœna, panem edere, et vinum bibere, non hoc voluit, ut fideles panem et vinum tantum percipiant, sine mysterio, sicut domi suæ panem manducant, sed ut rebus quoque significatis, spiritualiter communicent, et vere per fidem abluantur a peccatis, et Christo participent."

truth may be confounded. Yet we will add a few brief extracts from some others in order to show the unanimity with which this idea of a Sacrament was affirmed.

We intend to quote the *twentieth article* of the Former Helvetic Confession, which speaks of the *Force and Efficacy of the Sacraments*, in connection with Baptism, and shall therefore not anticipate it here. But we will give a few passages from the *Declaration* of the same Confession. "A Sacrament is not only a sign, but it is made up of two things, to wit: of a visible or earthly sign, and of the thing signified, which is heavenly; the which two although they make but one Sacrament, yet it is one thing which is received with the body, another thing which the faithful mind, being taught by the Spirit of God, doth receive. For the signs and the things signified by the signs, do cleave together only by a certain mystical union, or, as others speak, by a Sacramental union; neither be they so made one, that one is made in its nature the other, or that one is contained in the other."

"And seeing that the Sacraments are the institutions and work of the Lord Himself, the faithful do receive them, not as certain superfluous inventions of men, as if at the hand of men, but as his heavenly gifts, and that at the very hand of the Lord. For touching the Word of the Gospel which he preached, the Apostle writeth thus: 'When ye received of us the Word, whereby ye learned God, ye did not receive it as the word of men, but, as it was indeed, as the Word of God, who also worketh in you that believe.' 1 Thess. ii. 13. The like reason is there of the Sacraments. Therefore just as we do, and always did, receive these sentences of Scripture touching the Ministry of the Word, namely: The Minister doth convert, remit sins, open the eyes and hearts of men, give faith and the Spirit: so, being well understood, we do acknowledge also these sentences touching the Sacraments, namely: The Minister, through Baptism, doth regenerate, and wash away sins; he doth distribute and present the body and blood of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16. Matt. xxvi. 26. And it is manifest that the ancient Fathers did use such kind of speeches, because that by

this means they would propound and commend more royally the gifts of God."*

The Bohemian Confession says: "The Sacraments may be called the holy covenants of God with His Church, and of the Church with God; the ministration of faith and love, by which the conjunction and union of God, and of Christ our Lord, with believing people, and theirs again with Christ, and that among themselves, is made and perfected, in one spiritual body of the Church; by which also, even as by the Word, Christ and His Spirit do cause in the faithful, that is, in those that use them worthily, a precious participation of His excellent merit; neither doth He suffer them to be only bare and naked ministrations and ceremonies; but those things which they signify and witness outwardly, them doth He work inwardly to salvation, profitably and effectually; that is, He cleanseth, nourisheth, satisfyeth, looseth, remitteth and confirmeth."†

The following is from the twenty-first article of the Confession of Scotland: "The Sacraments not only do make a visible difference betwixt His people and those that are without His covenant, but also do exercise the faith of His children, and, by participation of the same Sacraments, do seal in their hearts the assurance of His promise, and of that most blessed conjunction, union and society, which the elect have with their head, Christ Jesus. And thus we utterly condemn the vanity of those that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs. No; we assuredly believe that by Baptism we are ingrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of His righteousness, by which our sins are covered, and remitted; and also that in the Supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us, that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls."‡

---

* Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession, under the head of *Holy Symbols*. Quoted from The Harmony of Protestant Confessions, 1581. Edited by the Rev. Peter Hall, M. A. London, 1842.

† Confession of Bohemia, chap. 11. Hall's Harm. of Prot. Conf.

‡ "Atque Sacramenta illa tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti nunc a Deo instituta, non tantum visibiliter inter populum ejus et eos qui extra fœdus sunt distin-

The Belgian Confession uses language of the same import. "The Sacraments are visible signs and tokens of internal and invisible things; by the which, as by certain means, God Himself worketh within us, through the power of the Holy Ghost. Therefore they are not vain or idle signs, neither yet ordained of God to deceive or frustrate us of our hope. For the truth of our Sacraments is Jesus Christ, without whom they are of no value."*

These citations fully sustain the general view we have presented of a Sacrament as held by the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century, and aid us in apprehending the true meaning of the sixty-sixth question of the Heidelberg Catechism. "The Sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel, namely, that He grants us out of free grace the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross."†

---

guere, sed etiam fidem suorum filiorum exercere, et participationem eorundem sacramentorum in illorum cordibus, certitudinem promissionis ejus, et felicissimæ illius conjunctionis, unionis et societatis, quam electi cum capite suo Jesu Christo habent, obsignare. Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacramenta nil aliud quam meraet nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus. Quin potius, certo credimus, per baptismum, nos in Christo Jesu inseri; justitiæque ejus per quam omnia nostra peccata teguntur et remittuntur, participes fieri: atque etiam quod in Cœna Domini rite usurpata, Christus ita nobis conjungitur, quod sit ipsissimum animarum nostrarum nutrimentum et pabulum." Conf. Scot. Fidei, 21.

* Conf. Belgica. Art. XXXIII. De Sacramentis. "Sunt enim Sacramenta signa, ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur. Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt, aut vacua; nec ad nos decipiendos aut frustrandos instituta. Ipsorum enim veritas ipse Jesus Christus, sine quo nullius prorsus essent momenti."

† Ursinus being the principal author of the Heidelberg Catechism, we quote some passages from his Theses on the Sacraments, given in his exposition of the text, in order to show the sense which he attached to his own language:

"There are two things to be considered in all Sacraments; the signs which are visible, earthly and corporeal; these are the rites and ceremonies, the things which are visible and corporeal, which God exhibits to us by the Minister, and which we receive corporeally; that is, by the members and senses of the body. Then we have the things signified, which are invisible, heavenly and spiritual, which include Christ Himself and all His benefits, and are communicated unto us of God by faith spiritually; that is, by the virtue and power of the Holy Spirit.

A Sacrament is not the external visible sign. This by itself is only natural water, or natural bread and wine. But the external sign, the natural element, is an integral part of a Sacrament. Without it there cannot be a Sacrament. On this point there is not a dissenting voice. All the Confessions condemn the notion that a Sacrament is a naked, empty, visible sign.

A Sacrament is not invisible grace, not Christ, not the blood and Spirit of Christ. In this consists the truth and virtue of a Sacrament; but a Sacrament in itself, by its very conception, as it obtained not only in the sixteenth century but in every age of the Church, is not equivalent to the idea of Christ, forgiveness of sins, or sanctification. Grace may confront us as a fact, or a doctrine, or a life, but in itself, disconnected from a natural element as its symbol, it belongs essentially to a category different from that of a Sacrament.

A Sacrament is that in which these two things are so really conjoined by *the Word of God*, that they are one. The Word of God makes the natural element the holy sign of a present, invisible, divine grace. In the first instance, Christ instituted the Sacraments by His Word. He took the natural bread, brake it, and said: Take, eat, this is my body. After the same manner, also, He took the cup, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood. By this, His Word and deed, the Holy Eucharist came into existence. So He commanded

---

"The change of the signs is not physical or natural, but merely relative; it has no respect to their nature or substance, which remains the same, but only to their use.

"The union between the signs and the things signified, is in like manner not natural or local, but relative, by the appointment of God, by which things invisible and spiritual are represented by those that are visible and corporeal, as by visible words, and *are exhibited and received in connection with the signs* in their lawful use.

"The names and properties of the things signified are attributed to the signs; and, on the other hand, the names of the signs are attributed to the things signified, on account of their analogy, or on account of the signification of the things through the signs, and on account of the *joint exhibition and reception of the things with the signs* in their lawful use.

"*The things signified are always received in connection with the signs* in the lawful use of the Sacraments. The signs are, therefore, not by any means empty or insignificant, notwithstanding the things are received in one way, and the signs in another." Williard's Ursinus, pp. 354, 355.

His Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. By the same Word of God the force of the original institution is perpetuated. "Christ's first institution and consecration standeth yet in force in the Church of God." The Minister, clothed with Christ's authority, represents Him, and officiates in His name. Christ speaks effectively in the divine Word which the lips of His minister utter. Thus whenever His minister takes the natural element and consecrates it by *the Word of God*, it ceases, in virtue of the power of Christ in His Word, to be a bare, naked, natural element, and becomes a holy sign, exhibiting the very presence of supernatural, saving grace. Not that the natural element ceases to be natural, but with the natural there is conjoined mystically the supernatural. For "they which celebrate the Sacraments no otherwise than the Lord Himself from the beginning hath appointed, have still, even to this day, the use and benefit of that most excellent consecration." It is this mystical conjunction, by the Word of God, of invisible grace with the visible sign, that constitutes a Sacrament according to all the Confessions of the Reformed Church. So real is this union, that these signs, "in this their holy use, take upon them the names of the things signified, and are not still called bare water, bread, or wine; but the water is called *regeneration* and the *bath of new birth*, and the bread and wine are called *the body and blood of the Lord.*"*

The *efficacy* of a Sacrament does not attach to the natural element as natural; not to water as bare water; not to bread and wine as bare bread and wine. The Confessions are unanimous in repudiating this absurd notion. "The outward signs are not the self-same thing, substantially and naturally, which they do signify; neither do they give it of themselves, and by their own power, no more than the Minister doth; but the Lord useth the Minister, and the signs and the Word, to this end, that, of His mere grace, He may represent, declare, visibly

* Conf. Helv. Posterior.

show, and set before our eyes, His heavenly gifts; and all this according to His promise."*

Nor is saving efficacy predicated of abstract divine grace. Non-sacramental grace, or the notion that the Holy Ghost by an immediate operation regenerates and saves men, is not recognized by the Confessions. While the Spirit by the preaching of the Gospel enlightens and awakens sinners before Baptism, this work of the Spirit does not supersede the necessity of the Sacraments, but only prepares the subject for the right observance of them. According to the Reformed idea of the established economy of salvation, there are in the Sacraments no bare, naked signs. "We utterly condemn the vanity of those, that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs."† On the other hand, the new life in Christ is not accessible to any who refuse to observe the Sacraments. "We condemn them also, who, because of the invisible things, do despise the visible, and think the signs superfluous, because they do already enjoy the things themselves."‡ The efficacy of the Sacraments, accordingly, does not attach to divine grace as such; not to grace conferred before Baptism, as if in virtue of the grace thus previously bestowed the Sacraments were made efficacious; nor to grace at hand and conferred independently of the Sacraments, as if saving grace were bestowed by an act of God which is direct and immediate, an act not mediated and conditioned by the ordinances of His own appointment.

But saving efficacy is predicated of a *Sacrament* proper; not of the natural element itself, nor of supernatural grace as such, neither one of which is a Sacrament; but of supernatural grace mystically conjoined with the natural element in the divine institution. In other words, the virtue of a Sacrament is not in the sign, nor in the thing signified, separately taken;

* Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession.

† Conf. Scot. 21. De Sac. "Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacramenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus."

‡ Conf. Helv. Posterior. 19. De Sac. "Neque eos probamus, qui propter invisibilia, aspernantur in sacramentis visibilia, adeoque signa sibi credunt fore supervacanea, quod rebus se jam frui arbitrantur." Niemeyer's Ref'd. Conf., p. 516.

but in the mystical union of the sign and the thing signified; for it is the mystical *union* of the natural and the supernatural, effected by the power of the Holy Ghost, in which, according to all the Reformed Confessions, the Sacraments consist.

REFORMED DOCTRINE OF HOLY BAPTISM.

This general idea of a Sacrament underlies the Reformed doctrine of Holy Baptism.

From the Confessions and Catechisms enumerated, we proceed now to quote at length their deliverances on the question, reserving comment and argument until we have given a complete exhibit of what they teach.

From the Confession of Augsburg, A. D. 1530.

Art. 9. "Concerning Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ. Also, that by Baptism the grace of God is offered: and that young infants are to be baptized: and that they, being by Baptism commended unto God, are received into God's favor, and are made the sons of God; as Christ witnesseth, speaking of little children in the Church. 'It is not the will of your Heavenly Father, that any of these little ones should perish.' Matt. xviii, 14. They condemn the Anabaptists, which allow not the Baptism of infants, and hold that infants are saved, though they die without Baptism, and be not within the Church of God."

This in another edition is set down thus:

"Touching Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that by Baptism the grace of God is offered; that children are to be baptized; and that such as by Baptism be presented to God, are received into His favor. They condemn the Anabaptists, that allow not of children's Baptism, and hold that children are saved without Baptism."

We have quoted this Article as translated in Hall's Harmony of Protestant Confessions; where the following note is appended: "Understand this by those things, which afterward were declared in the Agreement made at Wirtemburg in the year 1536, the 29th day of May; where these words be read: 'Master Luther and his fellows do agree upon this, that, by

the power of Christ, even those which are not baptized may be saved. But it is necessary that these should not condemn Baptism. And hence it is that they will have infants to be baptized of necessity."

From the Tetrapolitan Confession, 1530.

Chap. 17. "As touching Baptism, we confess, that which the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof: that we by it are buried into the death of Christ, Rom. 6: 3, 4; are made one body, 1 Cor. 12: 13; and do put on Christ, Gal. 3: 27; that it is the font of regeneration, Tit. 3: 5; that it washeth away sins, and saveth us. But all these things we so understand, as St. Peter hath interpreted them, where he saith: To the figure whereof, Baptism, that now is, answering, doth also save us; not by putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the profession of a good conscience toward God, 1 Pet. 3: 21. For without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11: 6. And we are saved by grace, and not by our works, Eph. 2: 8, 9. And seeing that Baptism is a Sacrament of that covenant, which God hath made with those that are his, promising that He will be their God, and the God of their seed, and that He will be a revenger of their wrongs, and will take them for His people; to conclude, seeing it is a token of the renewing of the spirit, which is wrought by Christ; therefore they do teach that it is to be given to infants also, as well as that in times past under Moses they were circumcised. For we are indeed the children of Abraham; and therefore that promise: I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, Gal. 3: 7, pertains no less unto us, than it did to that ancient people."

From the First Confession of Basel, 1534.

"And just as in Baptism, wherein is offered to us by the Minister of the Church, the washing away of sins, which certainly the Father, Son and Holy Ghost only can accomplish, there remaineth true water; so also in the Lord's Supper, wherein is figured and offered to us by the Minister of the Church, with the bread and cup of the Lord, and with the words

of the Supper, the true body and the true blood of Christ, there remaineth bread and wine."*

From the Confession of Bohemia, 1535.

We quote from the *Harmony of Confessions* of 1581. "Touching holy Baptism it is taught, that men must believe and profess, that this is a Sacrament, or wholesome ministry of the New Testament, instituted of Christ the Lord, concerning which the faithful ministers have in charge, that by the administration hereof they benefit the holy Church. This Sacrament consisteth of an outward washing that is done with water, with calling on the name of the holy Trinity; that of the element and the word there may arise, and be jointly made withal, a Sacrament. And that washing is used both to signify, and to witness, a spiritual washing and inward cleansing of the Holy Ghost from the disease of hereditary sin, and from other sins, the guilt of which is here forgiven and taken away; and to the attaining of a new manner of birth, that is, of regeneration, or a washing with water in the word of life. Acts 2: 38; 22: 16. For we believe that whatsoever by Baptism, as by a Sacrament added to the word of the Gospel, is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all that doth the Lord God work and perform inwardly; that is, that He washeth away sin, Tit. 3: 5; begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him, John 3: 5; and, through the washing of water, cleanseth by the word the Society of His Church, Eph. 5: 26, clotheth and appareleth it with His Son, Gal. 3: 27; burieth and taketh away sin, Rom. 6: 4; and giveth testimony to, and sealeth the peace of a good conscience, 1 Pet. 3: 21. For Baptism is not a washing away of the outward filth of the flesh, but the stipulation or promise that a good conscience maketh unto God. For the bestowing of these excellent fruits was

---

* "Und glych wie in dem Tauff, darinn uns die abweschung von den Sünden, die doch allein der Vatter, Son und heilig Geist, uszrichten müssend, durch den Diener der Kylchen, angebotten, blybt war wasser. Also auch, in des Herren Nachtmal, in uns, mit des Herren brot und tranck, sampt den worten des Nachtmals, der war lyb und das war blut Christi, durch den Diener der Kylchen fürbildet, und angebotten würdet, blybt brot und win." Basil. prior Conf. Fidei.

Holy Baptism given and granted to the Church; which the faithful shepherds of souls ought to administer, and which the faithful people of Christ, touching the receiving thereof, ought to use lawfully, but once only; yet, in deed and truth, throughout their whole life."

From the Former Helvetic Confession, 1536.

Art. 20. "The signs, which in the Church of God are called Sacraments, are two: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, being tokens of secret things, do not consist of bare signs, but of signs and things also. For in Baptism water is the sign, and the thing itself is regeneration, and adoption among the people of God. . . . Whereupon we affirm that Sacraments are not only tokens of human fellowship, but also pledges of the grace of God, by which the Ministers do work together with the Lord, to that end which He doth promise, offer and bring to pass; yet so, as we said before of the ministry of the Word, that all the saving power is to be ascribed to the Lord alone."*

Art. 21. "Baptism, according to the institution of the Lord, is the font of regeneration, the which the Lord doth give to His chosen in a visible sign, by the ministry of the Church, in such sort as we have declared before.† In which holy font we do therefore dip our infants, because that it is not lawful for us to reject them from the company of the people of God, which are born of us, who are the people of God, and all but pointed out by the voice of God; especially seeing we ought godly to presume of their election."

The Declaration of the same Confession presented by Bucer to the Assembly at Smalcald in 1537, says: "Baptism is a

---

*The text is a translation from the Latin. We add the German: 20. "Deren zeichen, die man sacrament nempt, sind zwey, namlich der touff, und dz nachtmal des heren. Dise sacrament sind beduetliche heilige zeichen, und hoher heimlichen dingen, die aber nit blosse und lere zeichen sind, sunder sy bestond in zeichen und weselichen dingen. Dann im touff ist das wasser das zeichen, das weselich aber und geistlich ist die widergeburt und die uffnemung in das volk gottes."

†21. "Der touff ist uss der insatzung des heren, ein widergeberliche abweschung, wöliche der her sinen uszerwölten mit einem sichtbaren zeichen, durch den dienst der kilchen wie obengeredt und erlütret ist, anbütet und darstelt."

Sacrament wherein the Lord by a visible sign doth testify His grace unto us; whereby He doth regenerate us, and cleanse us from our sins, and also receive us to be His people, that we may live to Christ, die to the old Adam, and be partakers of the good things of Christ. For we are all born sinners; whereupon we have need of regeneration, and the purging of our sins, which cometh to pass by the free mercy of God; whereby also we are received into the covenant, that, being buried into His death, we may rise again in newness of life."

From the Genevan Catechism by Calvin, 1538.

"What is the significance of Baptism?

It has two parts; on the one hand, the forgiveness of sins is figured, and on the other spiritual regeneration.

What resemblance does water bear to these things, that it may represent them?

The forgiveness of sin is a kind of bath, in which our souls are cleansed of their stains, for only by water is the filth of the body washed away.

What as to regeneration?

Since its beginning is the mortification of our nature but the end that we be new creatures, the figure of death is set before us in this, that water is poured upon the head; but the figure of a new life in this, that we do not remain sunk under the water, but for a moment at least we go as it were into the grave that we may immediately rise again.

Do you think that the water is the bath of the soul?

By no means. For it is wrong to snatch this honor from the blood of Christ, which was poured forth to this end that, having cleansed us from all our sins, He might present us pure and without spot before God. 1 Pet. 1: 19; John 1: 7. And we possess the fruit of this cleansing, when the Holy Spirit sprinkles our consciences with that sacred blood. But the seal we have in the Sacrament.

Do you then ascribe nothing more to the water than this only, that it is a figure of washing?

I regard it as a figure with which the truth is at the same time conjoined. For God in promising to us His gifts does not

deceive us. Hence it is certain that both the pardon of sins and the new life are offered to us, and received by us, in Baptism.*

Is this grace bestowed on all indiscriminately?

As many by their wickedness shut up the way to it, they make it of no effect for themselves. Therefore the fruit comes to none but to believers only. Yet for this reason, nothing is abated of the nature of Baptism.

But whence is regeneration?

From the death of Christ, and also from His resurrection. For by the power of His death, our old man is crucified, and the corruption of our nature is in a manner buried, that it may no longer live in us. But that we are changed into a new life unto obedience of the righteousness of God, this is the benefit of the resurrection.

How are these benefits conferred upon us through Baptism?

Because, we put on Christ and are given His Spirit, unless, by rejecting the promises here offered to us, we render them unfruitful."

From the Gallican Confession, 1559.

Art. 35. "We acknowledge that there are two only Sacraments common to the whole Church. Whereof the first is Baptism: the which is given to us to testify our adoption; because that therein we are ingrafted into Christ's body, that, being washed in His blood, we may also be renewed to holiness of life by His Spirit. This also we say; that although we are baptized but once, yet the fruit of baptism doth pertain to the whole course of our life: that this promise, to wit, that Christ will be always unto us sanctification, and justification may be sealed up in us with a pure and firm seal. Furthermore, although Baptism is a Sacrament of faith and repentance, yet, seeing that, together with their parents, God doth account their posterity also to be of the Church, we affirm, that infants, being born of holy parents, are by the authority of Christ to be baptized."†

* "Proinde et peccatorum veniam et vitae novitatem offerri nobis in Baptismo, et recipi a nobis certum est." Cat. Gen. 5, De Sac.

† Art. xxxv. Agnoscimus duo tantum Sacramenta toti Ecclesiae communia, quo-

Art. 38. "We say therefore, that the element of water, be it never so frail, doth notwithstanding truly witness or confirm unto us the inward washing of our souls in the blood of Jesus Christ, by the virtue and efficacy of the Holy Ghost."*

From the Confession of Scotland, 1560.

Art. 21. "We totally condemn those who affirm that the Sacraments are nothing more than mere naked signs. But on the contrary, we believe certainly, that, through Baptism, we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ,† and are made partakers of His righteousnes through which all our sins are covered and remitted."

From the Anglican Confessions.

The XLII Articles of Edward VI, 1552. "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and a mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from those who are not Christians, but it is also a sign of regeneration, whereby those who receive Baptism rightly, are, as by an instrument, grafted into the Church; the promises of the remission of sins and our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace is increased by virtue of prayer unto God."

Of the Thirty-nine Articles, 1562, Article XXVII, which speaks of Baptism, is expressed in the same words.

As this language is not unequivocal, and therefore susceptible of an interpretation not in full harmony with other Reformed Confessions, we quote the article on *Sin after Baptism*, as indicating the sense in which the language must, be understood.

Art. XVI. *Of Sin after Baptism.* "Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost,

---

rum prius est Baptismus, nobis testificandae nostrae adoptioni datus, quoniam in eo inserimur Christi corpori, ut ejus sanguine abluti, simul etiam ipsius spiritu ad vitae sanctimoniam renovemur."

* Art. xxxviii. Dicimus itaque elementum aquae, quantumvis caducum, nobis nihilominus vere testificari interiorem animi nostri ablutionem in sanguine Jesu Christi per sancti spiritus efficaciam."

†21. "Quin potius, certo credimus, per baptism um, nos in Christo Jesu inseri."

and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent."

From the Belgic Confession, 1562.

Art. 34. "We believe and confess, that Jesus Christ, who is the end of the law, hath by His own blood-shedding made an end of all other propitiatory sacrifice for sins. Also that Circumcision which was done by blood, being abolished, He hath instituted Baptism in the place thereof; whereby we are received into the Church of God, and separated from all other nations, and all kind of strange religions, being consecrated unto Him alone, whose badge and mark we wear. Finally, Baptism is a token to us that He will be our God forever, who is also our gracious Father. Therefore the Lord hath commanded all his to be baptized with pure water, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to signify that the blood of Christ doth internally, through the operation of the Spirit, perform and effect that in the soul, which water doth externally work upon our bodies. For as water, being poured upon us, and appearing on the body of him that is baptized, moistening the same, doth wash away the filthiness of the body; so the blood of Christ, washing the soul, doth cleanse it from sin, and doth change us, who are children of wrath, into sons of God. Not that this material water doth these things; but the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son of God, which is unto us as the Red Sea, which we must pass through, that we may depart from the tyranny of Pharaoh, that is, the Devil, and enter into the spiritual land of Canaan. Therefore Ministers verily do deliver unto us the Sacrament, and the visible thing; but the Lord Himself giveth unto us that which is represented by the Sacrament, namely, the gifts and invisible graces: washing, purifying and cleansing our souls from

all spots and iniquities; renewing also and filling our hearts with all comfort; and giving unto us a certain persuasion of His fatherly goodness, clothing us with the new man, and taking off the old man with all his deeds. Moreover, we believe that every one who desires to obtain eternal life, ought to be baptized with one Baptism, and to be content with this one Baptism, which never afterwards is to be repeated, seeing that we cannot be born twice.

"Neither does this Baptism profit us only at that moment, when the water rests upon us, or when we are sprinkled with it, but throughout the whole time of our life; otherwise it were necessary that we have the head always sprinkled with water."

From the Heidelberg Catechism, 1563.

Q. 69. "How is it signified and sealed unto thee in Holy Baptism, that thou hast part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross?

Thus: that Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise, that I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away.

Q. 70. What is it to be washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ?

It is to have the forgiveness of sins from God, through grace, for the sake of Christ's blood, which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross; and also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ, that so we may more and more die unto sin, and lead holy and unblamable lives.

Q. 71. Where has Christ promised that we are as certainly washed with His blood and spirit as with the water of Baptism?

In the institution of Baptism, which runs thus: Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He

that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. This promise is also repeated, where the Scripture calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins.

Q. 72. Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?

No; for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin.

Q. 73. Why, then, doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins?

God speaks thus not without great cause; namely, not only to teach us thereby that like as the filthiness of the body is taken away by water, so also our sins are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ; but much more, that by this divine pledge and token He may assure us, that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water."

From the Second Helvetic Confession, 1562, 1566.

20. "There is but one Baptism in the Church of God: for it is sufficient to be once baptized or consecrated to God. For Baptism once received doth continue all a man's life, and is a perpetual sealing of our adoption unto us. For to be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, introduced, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; yea, and in this life to be called after the name of God, that is, to be called a son of God; to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and endued with the manifold grace of God, unto a new and innocent life. Baptism therefore doth call to mind, and keep in remembrance, the great benefit of God performed to mankind. For we are all born in the pollution of sin, and are the sons of wrath. But God, who is rich in mercy, doth freely purge us from our sins by the blood of His Son, and in Him doth adopt us to be His sons, and by an holy covenant joins us to Himself, and enriches us with divers gifts, that we may live a new life. All these things are sealed in Baptism. For inwardly we are regenerated, purified,

and renewed of God by the Holy Spirit; and outwardly we receive the sealing of most notable gifts by the water, by which also those great benefits are represented, and, as it were, set before our eyes to be looked upon. And therefore are we baptized, that is, washed and sprinkled with visible water. For the water maketh clean that which is filthy, and refresheth and cooleth the bodies that fail and faint. And the grace of God dealeth in like manner with the soul; and that invisibly and spiritually."*

From the Confession of John Sigismund, Margrave of Brandenburg, 1614.

"Of Holy Baptism, the first Sacrament of the New Testament, His Electoral Grace believes and confesses that it is really a bath of new birth and renewal in the Holy Ghost,† and that no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven except he be born again of water and the Spirit; not that the outward water can wash away the sins both of unbelievers and believers, and regenerate them, but that in this holy Sacrament believers are adopted to be children of God, are cleansed from their sins by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, and by this visible sign of the Covenant of grace are as by a certain seal assured of their salvation."

---

* *Conf. Helv. Posterior XX.* "Unus est duntaxat Baptismus in Ecclesia Dei, et satis est semel baptisari, vel initiari Deo. Durat autem semel susceptus baptismus, per omnem vitam, et est perpetua obsignatio adoptionis nostrae. Etenim baptisari in nomine Christi, est inscribi, initiari, et recipi in foedus, atque familiam, adeoque in haereditatem filiorum Dei, imo jam nunc nuncupari nomine Dei, id est, appellari filium Dei, purgari item a sordibus peccatorum, et donari varia Dei gratia, ad vitam novam et innocentem. Baptismus ergo in memoria retinet, et reparat ingeus Dei beneficium, generi mortalium praestitum. Nascimur enim omnes in peccatorum sordibus, et sumus filii irae. Deus autem qui dives est misericordia, purgat nos a peccatis gratuito, per sanguinem filii sui, et in hoc adoptat nos in filios, adeoque foedere sancto nos sibi connectit et variis donis ditat, ut pos simus novam vivere vitam. Obsignantur haec omnia baptismo. Nam intus regeneramur, purificamur, et renovamur a Deo per spiritum sanctum: foris autem accipim us obsignationem maximorum donorum, in aqua, qua etiam maxima illa beneficia repraesentantur et veluti oculis nostris conspicienda proponuntur. Ideoque baptisamur, id est, abluimur, aut aspergimur aqua visibili. Aqua enim sordes mundat, deficientia et aestuantia recreat, et refrigerat corpora. Gratia vero Dei haec animabus praestat, et quidem invisibiliter vel spiritualiter."

†"Von der heiligen Tauffe, als dem ersten Sacrament des Neuen Testaments

From the Confession of Poland, or Declaration of Thorn, 1645.*

"Baptism is a Sacramtnt of the New Testament, instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ and to be administered by the Minister of the Word, both to infants born in the Church, and to adults coming into the Church by profession of faith, by the washing of water in the name of the Holy Trinity; in order to signify and witness the internal absolution from sins, or the remission of sins, by the blood of Christ, and to effect a renewal, or regeneration, by the Holy Ghost.

"We solemnly declare accordingly that this Sacrament, because itself the appointment of Christ, is altogether necessary, as the ordinary medium of salvation; though we do not affirm that this necessity is so absolute, that whosoever, whether an infant or adult, has departed this life without external Baptism, must in every case, even if it happen without any contempt, be damned. Here rather does this rule especially prevail, that not the want but the contempt of the Sacra ment damns."

From the Westminster Confession of Faith, 1648.

"Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; which Sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in His Church until the end of the world."

"Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated.

"The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time

---

glauben und bekennen Seine Churf. Gn. dass dieselbe sey wahrhaftig ein Bad der Wiedergeburt und Erneurung im Heiligen Geist." Conf. Sigismundi.

* Generalis Professio, Doctrinae Ecclesiarum Reformatarum in Regno Poloniae, Magno Ducatu Lithuaniae, annexisque Regni Provinciis, in Conventu Thoruniensi, An. 1645, ad liquidationem Controversiarum maturandam, exhibita. d. 1, Sep.

wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such, whether of age or infants, as that grace belongeth unto,* according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time."

From the Larger Catechism.

Q. 165. What is Baptism?

A. Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself, of remission of sins by His blood, and regeneration by His Spirit; of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's."

Comment and Argument.

Here we have before us, drawn out in full, the explicit teaching of the Reformed Church on the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. These Confessions represent not only Switzerland, France, Germany, Belgium, Poland, England and Scotland, but Holland, Hungary, and every other country or State to which the Reformed Church gained access during the sixteenth century. They extend from the year 1530 to 1648, that is, into the middle of the seventeenth century, thus showing that amid all the civil convulsions, and the philosophical and theological conflicts of the age, the original doctrine lived on in the faith and consciousness of the Church.

In full harmony with the general idea of a Sacrament already given, the Confessions teach that Baptism *consists of two things:* a visible sign and invisible grace; the visible being water, or an external washing of the body with water; whilst the invisible is the blood and Spirit of Christ, or the inward cleansing of the

* The *Confession of Faith* limits the saving efficacy of Holy Baptism to those whom "God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory." Those who are "fore-ordained to everlasting death" receive no spiritual benefit from the Sacrament.

soul from the pollution of sin and the quickening of the new life in Christ by the Holy Ghost.

The natural element of water is not Baptism; though it is an essential part of the Sacrament. The Confessions attach importance to the washing with water as an indispensable part of the transaction; but always repudiate the notion that the external washing is Holy Baptism proper, or the substance and truth of the Sacrament.

Nor does the forgiveness of sins and regeneration by the blood and Spirit of Christ constitute Baptism. The grace of God in Jesus Christ is indeed the principal part of the Sacrament, but disconnected from the washing with water it is no more entitled to the name of Baptism than is the simple external washing with water itself. Disjoined, neither one is the Sacrament. There is not, on the one hand, a Sacrament of water-baptism, and on the other, a Sacrament of Spirit-baptism. Of such distinction and dualistic opposition there is no trace in any of the Confessions.

Holy Baptism is that divine ordinance in which *these two things are united.* This is either clearly expressed or necessarily implied in all the teachings of the Confessions. In addition to the proofs furnished in support of the general idea of a Sacrament as held by the Reformed Church, we will cite a few passages pertaining to the constitution of Baptism. "This Sacrament consisteth of an outward washing, that is done with water with calling on the name of the Holy Trinity; in order that, of the element and the Word, there may arise, and be jointly made withal, a Sacrament."* "There is in every Sacrament," says the Westminster Confession of Faith, "a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."† In answer to the Question: What are the parts of a Sacrament? the Larger Catechism answers: "The parts of a Sacrament are two; the one, an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's own

* Conf. of Bohemia. Chap 12..

† Westminster Confession of Faith. Chap. 27, 2.

appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified."* The spiritual grace is as really and truly a part of Baptism as the outward sign; and the spiritual grace, according to this same Catechism, is remission of sins by the blood of Christ and regeneration by His spirit.†

On this point Ursinus is very explicit in his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism. "There is in Baptism," he says, "a double water: the one external and visible, which is elementary; the other internal, invisible and heavenly, which is the blood and Spirit of Christ. There is also a double washing in Baptism;‡ the one external, visible and signifying, namely, the sprinkling and pouring with water, which is perceptible by the members and senses of the body; the other internal, invisible and signified, namely, the remission of sins on account of the blood of Christ shed for us, and our regeneration by the Holy Spirit and ingrafting into His body, which is spiritual, and perceived only by faith and the Spirit."§ Now, bearing in mind that in his *Theses concerning Sacraments in general*, he maintains that "the things signified are always received in connection with the signs in the lawful use of the Sacraments," there can be no doubt as to his true meaning. Nor can there be any doubt as to the doctrine taught by the Heidelberg Catechism, when it affirms that "I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water."

---

* Larger Catechism. Q. 163.

† Larger Catechism. Q. 165.

‡ "Baptism comprehends these three things:

1. The sign, which is water and the ceremony connected with it.

2. The things which are* signified thereby, which are the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, the mortification of the old man, and the quickening of the new man.

3. The command and promise of Christ, from which the sign obtains its authority and power to confirm." Williard's Ursinus, p. 357.

In this analytical definition, as it may be called, Ursinus teaches positively that the quickening of the new man is as really a part of Baptism as the outward washing with water. The three things specified are each an essential part of the Sacrament.

* This is the word used in Parry's translation.

§ Williard's Ursinus, p. 372, 4th Thesis on Baptism.

The union of spiritual cleansing and regeneration with the outward washing with water, is not natural, nor local, but mystical. It is established by the Word of Christ in the original institution of Baptism. The Word of Christ thus connecting the spiritual and the natural is of force always, not effectual only in the moment when He spoke the Word, but effectual for all time.* When a Minister of Christ administers the solemn rite in the name of the Holy Trinity, thus repeating by His authority His own words, the baptismal transaction is no less divine than human; an internal saving act of Christ by His own Word and Spirit, no less than an external act by His Minister. "Christ baptizes us by the hand of His Ministers, just as He speaks through them." †

It is of this mystical union of the cleansing and regenerating power of Christ by His Spirit with the outward washing with water, that the *objective efficacy* of Baptism is predicated. Not of the outward washing with water simply. "Not that this material water doth these things." ‡ Calvin asks: "Do you think that the water is the bath of the soul?" and then answers: "By no means." § In like manner, the Heidelberg Catechism denies that the outward washing with water is itself the washing away of sins.

Nor is the objective saving efficacy predicated of the blood and Spirit of Christ separately taken; as if any person refusing to be baptized, might apply directly to Christ and obtain from Him by His Spirit the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, without the intervention of Holy Baptism. As we said before of the general doctrine of a Sacrament, so now we say of this particular doctrine, that there is in the Reformed Confessions no trace of the theory of abstract saving grace, now so extensively prevalent among our American Churches, as must be evi-

*"For we believe that the Baptism of the Church, which is but one, was sanctified in God's first institution of it, and is consecrated with the Word, and is now of full force, by and for the first blessing of God upon it." Latter Confession of Helvetia. Chap. 20.

† Williard's Ursinus. Page 372.

‡ Belgian Conf. Art 34.

§ Gen. Cat. V. De Sac.

dent to any unprejudiced mind that will carefully examine the extracts which we have embodied in this Article. The Confessions nowhere recognize the notion that a sinner may reject or neglect the sign, and yet possess the thing signified; that he may refuse the external washing with water, and yet receive the inward cleansing by the Spirit. On the contrary to be baptized is a first and positive duty, imposed by the direct command of Christ, and incumbent unconditionally upon all to whom the Gospel is proclaimed. Those who refuse to comply with His command commit sin against Christ, and persist in sinning against Him so long as they refuse. *

The Confessions are very careful to draw a broad line of distinction between the visible sign and the invisible grace, between the outward washing with water and the inward cleansing of the Spirit. Just as clearly do they discriminate between the efficacy of the two parts. Whilst the power of spiritual cleansing is denied of natural water, it is affirmed only of the blood and Spirit of Christ. On this point, the Heidelberg Catechism expresses unequivocally the opinion common to all the Reformed Confessions. To the question: "Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?" the answer is given, "No; for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit can cleanse from all sin." Says the Confession of Belgium: "The truth of our Sacraments is Jesus Christ, without whom they are of no value;" and the Confession of France: "The whole substance and truth of the outward signs is in Christ Jesus; from whom if they be separated they be nothing else but vain shadows and smoke." The saving efficacy of Baptism is not in natural water, but belongs exclusively to the Spirit of Christ; and the subject derives no spiritual benefit from external washing, but only from the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost.

---

* "They, therefore, which contemn these Sacraments, and through stubbornness will not suffer them to be of any force with themselves, and making small account of them, do esteem them as trifles, or do otherwise abuse them, contrary to the institution, will, or commandment of Christ; all these do grievously sin against the Author thereof, who hath instituted them, and make a very great hazard of their salvation." Confession of Bohemia. Chap. 2.

If we interpret such language in the light of the modern theory of Baptism, a theory which the Confessions deny and reject, it may easily be perverted, and be made to convey a meaning which seems to support the notion of abstract saving grace. Such an interpretation, however, would do violence to the theory of a Sacrament which the Reformed Confessions affirm most explicitly, as well as to the logical connection of the language. If anything be certain beyond the shadow of a doubt, it is that Baptism, according to all the Confessions, is the mystical conjunction of the blood and Spirit of Christ with the outward washing with water, established and perpetuated through all time by the Word of God, which conjunction or union is so real that the sign takes the name of the thing signified, and so essential that either one part without the other, the sign without the thing signified, or the thing signified without the sign, would not be Baptism.

But if the broad distinction which the Confessions draw between the natural water and the work of the Spirit, denying saving efficacy of the one and affirming it only of the other, be understood in the light of their own idea of Baptism, this distinction will be seen to be both important and necessary; for it is made, not to deny objective efficacy of Holy Baptism proper, nor to affirm that salvation from sin and regeneration are effected by the Holy Spirit independently of this Sacrament; but in order to deny cleansing and quickening virtue of the outward washing separately considered, and to affirm that these spiritual blessings are conferred by the blood and Spirit of Christ as the thing signified and really present and operative in the sacramental transaction.

The Confessions teach accordingly that *we receive forgiveness of sins, and are born again of the Spirit, through the Sacrament of Baptism.* As this is a turning point in the question, let us briefly review the evidence.

"And as the Lord is the author of the Sacraments, so he continually worketh in that Church where they are rightly used; so that the faithful, when they receive them of the Ministers do know that *the Lord worketh in his own ordi-*

nance, and therefore they receive them as from the hand of God." "Inwardly we are regenerated, purified, and renewed of God through the Holy Spirit, and outwardly we receive the sealing of most notable gifts by the water." Latter Helvetic Confession, Chap. 19, 20.

"In Baptism water is the sign, and the thing itself is regeneration, and adoption among the people of God." Former Helvetic Confession, Art. 20. "Baptism is a Sacrament *whereby the Lord doth regenerate us*, and cleanse us from our sins." Declaration of the same Confession.

"For we confess * that these outward signs are such, that *God* by the power of His Holy Spirit, *doth work by them*, that nothing may be there represented in vain." "In Baptism we are ingrafted into Christ's body." Gallican Confession, Art. 34, 35.

"We believe certainly, that, *through Baptism*, we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ." Conf. of Scotland.

"It is certain that both the pardon of sins, and the new life are *offered* to us, and *received* by us, *in Baptism*." Genevan Catechism by Calvin.

"By the Sacraments, as by certain means, God Himself worketh within us, through the power of the Holy Ghost." "The Lord hath commanded all his to be baptized with pure water, to signify that the blood of Christ doth internally, through the operation of the Spirit, perform and effect that in the soul, which water doth externally work upon our bodies." Belgic Confession.

"To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be purged from the filthiness of sins, and endued with the manifold grace of God, unto a new and innocent life." Latter Helvetic Conf.

"By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost." Westminster Confession of Faith.

These citations might easily be multiplied. But it is scarcely

* "Fatemur enim, talia esse signa haec exteriora, *ut Deus per illa*, sancti sui spiritus virtute, operetur, ne quicquam ibi frustra nobis significetur. Conf. Fidei Gall Art. xxxiv.

necessary. Those given are so clear, direct and unequivocal, especially when taken together, and in connection with the entire doctrine of the Confessions relatively to the Sacraments, that there is no room for two opinions. Through all of them runs the same general idea, namely, that God forgives our sins, and communicates a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost through the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. In some the doctrine is defined on all sides dialectically, and with so much perspicuity and force that it stands in the firmament of the Reformed Church as distinctly as the sun in the heavens. In others, it is not taught so explicitly, because there is either no reference to opposing Romish, Anabaptistic or Rationalistic errors, or the opposition between the truth and various errors is not so nicely and formally defined; but the doctrine, as we have stated it, underlies and pervades every Confession.

There are *two points* more that require consideration.

In order to complete a correct view of the Reformed doctrine of Baptism, it is important not to confound its objective efficacy with its subjective efficacy. Though these philosophic terms do not occur in the Confessions, yet the facts which these terms designate are very carefully distinguished. The objective efficacy is the divine power belonging to, and inherent in, the constitution of Baptism itself, irrespectively of the use or abuse of the Sacrament by men. The subjective efficacy is this same power actualized in the conversion, sanctification, and the final complete salvation of the subjects of Baptism. All of us make the same distinction in regard to the Word of God. The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword (Heb. v. 12.). There is divine power in the Word itself, whether men receive it or reject it. This is its objective efficacy. But the preaching of the Word may issue in the personal salvation, or the personal damnation, of those that hear it, according as they receive it in true faith, or reject it in unbelief. The subjective efficacy of the preached Word does not depend exclusively on the Word itself; but depends also on the will of men. What the Word is in itself, it is and ever will be, whether the millions who hear it are finally saved, or but

hundreds. The same distinction is to be made in regard to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Now the Reformed Confessions teach that the *objective* efficacy of Baptism is *unconditional.* What it is in itself does not depend on the worthiness or moral character of the officiating minister, nor upon the worthiness or moral character of the persons baptized. The washing with water becomes a Sacrament by the Word of God, not by the word of man. As its intrinsic power is not derived from the piety of the minister, so neither can this power be diminished or affected by his want of piety.

So the Confessions teach. "As we esteem not the goodness of the Sacrament by the worthiness or unworthiness of the Ministers, so likewise we do not weigh them by the condition of the receivers. For we know that the goodness of the Sacraments doth depend upon the faithfulness, or truth, or mere goodness of God. For even as God's Word remaineth the true Word of God; wherein not only bare words are uttered when it is preached, but therewithal the things signified by the words are offered of God, although the wicked and unbelievers hear and understand the words, yet enjoy not the things signified, because they receive them not by a true faith; even so, the Sacraments, consisting of the Word, the signs, and the things signified, continue true and perfect Sacraments, not only because they be holy things, but also for that God also offereth the things, howsoever the unbelievers receive not the things which are offered. This cometh to pass, not by any fault in God, the author and offerer of them; but by the fault of men, who do receive them without faith, and unlawfully; whose unbelief cannot make the truth of God of none effect, Rom. iii: 3." Latter Helvetic Confession, Chap. 19.

"Seeing that the institution and work of the Word and of the Sacraments proceed not from men, but from God; we do here reject the error of the Donatists and Anabaptists, who esteemed the holy gifts of God according to the worthiness and unworthiness of the minister." Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession.

These quotations from the two Swiss Confessions express clearly the Reformed view concerning the objective constitution of Baptism. By the Word of God the efficacious grace of Christ is joined unconditionally to the washing with natural water in the Sacrament. We say *unconditionally* relatively to men. The will of men, the character of men, is not a condition of the constitution of Baptism. The only condition is the Word and power of Christ working by the Holy Ghost. The Word has been spoken. The sacred mystery is established, and is continued with all its original force perennially, from age to age, by the ever living power of the Word in the Church.

The officiating Minister may be unworthy. He may administer the Sacrament without a due sense of its great solemnity. But his unworthiness does not change the Sacrament into something that is not proper Baptism; nor does it limit or diminish its efficacy or force as a grace-bearing ordinance.

Nor does the character of the subject affect its objective constitution and efficacy. Whether it be Paul or Simon Magus that is baptized, the Sacrament in itself is the same. The subject is introduced into the covenant of grace, and made a member of the Church of Christ. Baptism is and remains always the sign and seal of divine grace, just as the Word is the same power of God whether Paul proclaims it to Timothy or to Felix. Or just as natural birth makes the child a member of the family, and invests it with all the rights of a child, whether as it grows up it honors father and mother, or dishonors them.

But the subjective efficacy of baptism is *not unconditional.* Whether or not Baptism issue in a godly life and eternal salvation, depends also on the will and character of the subject. A baptized person must recognize and improve the grace conferred in Baptism. This he may fail to do. Like the prodigal son, he may leave his Father's house, and waste his inheritance in riotous living. Or like Esau, he may sell his birth-right for a mess of pottage. Simon Magus, after receiving Baptism, was in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. Ananias and Saphira were baptized and celebrated the holy Eucharist,

but they lied to the Holy Ghost, and were punished with instantaneous death. These being dead branches on the true Vine, are cut off and cast into the fire.

Baptismal grace does not constrain the will of man as by an external force. He is free to choose between good and evil. He may yield, and particularly if rightly instructed, he is predisposed to yield, to the constraining power of the Holy Ghost given him in Baptism, repent and believe, follow Christ, and ultimately attain to the resurrection of the dead. Or he may abuse the grace he possesses. He may resist the constraining power of the Spirit, live in sin and wickedness, and inherit everlasting punishment. Just as the hearer of the Word may close his heart against its penetrating power, shut his eyes to the light of truth, and live on in worldliness, vanity and sin. Or just as a son, possessing all the advantages of Christian parentage, of high social position, and liberal education, may nevertheless disobey his father and mother, follow the tendencies of a perverse will, serve the lusts of the flesh, and become an outcast from society.

There is no conflict or inconsistency between these two things, either in fact or logically. The Confessions teach both with equal clearness. Whilst the objective efficacy is *unconditional*, the subjective efficacy is *conditional*. In the Genevan Catechism, in answer to the question: "Is this grace bestowed on all indiscriminately?" Calvin says: "As many by their wickedness shut up the way to it, they make it of no effect for themselves. Therefore the fruit comes to none but to believers only. Yet for this reason nothing is abated of the nature of Baptism."* The essential nature and objective efficacy of the Sacrament are unaffected by those who receive baptismal grace in vain. It is only through the repentance and faith of the baptized that this grace issues in an actual Christian life and experience. For want of repentance and faith, though Baptism does not fail to fulfil its office, many make it

* "Multi dum illa sua pravitate viam præcludunt, efficiunt, ut sibi sit inanis. Ita non nisi ad fideles solos peverint fructus. Verum, inde nihil Sacramenti naturae decedit." Catech. Genev. De Sac.

of no effect for themselves. They do not possess the fruit. They abuse the grace conferred on them. Members of the family of God, its spiritual blessings all sealed to them, possessing the Holy Spirit, and entitled to all the grace needful in order to overcome the power of sin, conquer the world and the devil, and attain to a resurrection in the likeness of the Redeemer, they yet fail to realize the end of baptismal grace, because they ignore their filial relation to their Heavenly Father, despise the spiritual blessings sealed to them, grieve the Holy Spirit working in them, and resist the grace by which they have been apprehended.

This abuse of baptismal grace does not annul the objective nature, efficacy, and design of Holy Baptism. That, we repeat, is unaffected by their wickedness. In itself and in its relations it is the same divine institution and divine transaction.

Nor, on the other hand, does baptismal grace destroy the moral nature of men. Because God, in the Baptismal act, translates the subject from the sphere of fallen nature into the real kingdom of grace present on earth, it does not follow that he, though chosen of God, must not also choose Christ himself, and live in His service faithfully to the end, in order to be saved; nor does it follow that he can choose Christ and persevere in His service without a free act of his own will. He is qualified and disposed, by the possession of divine grace, both to resolve to follow Christ, and to carry out his resolution steadily against all opposition; which implies, however, that he is able also not to resolve thus to follow Christ. More than this. He is not only able not to resolve to follow Christ, but, as his old, fallen nature is not yet extinct, but only in process of total destruction, he is ever in real danger, though engrafted into Christ by the Spirit, of falling away from Christ through the allurements of the world and the assaults of the devil, and being lost. Baptism renders salvation possible; it puts the baptized person in a state of grace, a position in which he can watch and pray, worship God acceptably, be nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, grow in faith and knowledge, and fight against sin and Satan in the full armor of the Gospel.

But it does not make salvation from sin certain unconditionally. It does not remove the danger of failure. It does not impose upon the baptized person the necessity of becoming an earnest Christian and persevering in the Christian life. He is not forced to walk in the way of actual salvation. Otherwise a man would no longer be a free moral being.

Yet the possibility of salvation is real. If the baptized person will but surrender himself from the heart to his Saviour, and remain faithful to his calling unto death, baptismal grace will be consummated in his resurrection from the dead and his entrance into the perfect state of glory. The subjective conditions being met, the life everlasting is as undoubted and certain as the fact of Baptism.

Without baptism this real possibility does not exist. According to the established economy of grace, he only enters into the kingdom who believes the gospel and is baptized.

This relation of Baptism to the baptized, the Confessions, as we have seen, compare to the relation which the preaching of the Word bears to the hearers, and illustrate the one by the other. The preaching of the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all those that believe. Divine power is inherent in the Word. But the hearer is not forced to receive it. If he remain in unbelief and sin, it does not follow that the Word is not a divine power in itself. The practical effect of the Word is conditional, but its objective force is unconditional.

But we may illustrate the same idea by an analogous fact in human life. A young mam may be endowed with extraordinary powers of mind, qualifying him to become a profound scholar, an eminent author, a prominent statesman, or a great artist. Yet he may not become either one or the other. The real possibilities of his genius may never be realized.* To become in fact what he is potentially, he needs opportunity or occasion, education, and above all things, a will to act. Wanting in these, particularly in will, he may live and die as though, for all practical purposes at least, he were not thus endowed.

*The beautiful lines of Thomas Gray, in his celebrated Elegy, naturally suggest themselves:

Because endowed with extraordinary natural powers, it does not follow, necessarily, that he will become an eminent and influential man. This result is conditional. It depends upon himself.

Nor does it follow, because he fails to attain to eminence and distinction, that he is not more highly endowed than the majority of men. What he is by natural birth, is unconditional. It does not depend upon himself, not upon opportunity or education, not upon his will.

So is a man born into the kingdom of Heaven by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, endowed with divine grace, which is the new life in Christ Jesus. He is a babe in Christ. As such, there is in him the real possibility of a complete normal development of spiritual life, including the fruits of the Spirit, the resurrection from the dead, and glorification with Christ in Heaven. But as he is a person, neither a machine nor an animal, this actual result depends upon tuition and discipline, but mainly upon his own will and intelligence. Whilst God works in him both to will and to do, he must also work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, (Phil. ii, 12.) Therefore he may fail to become, in fact, in the kingdom of Heaven what he is potentially, in virtue of his new birth of the Spirit; just as the design of God may never be realized when He endows a person, by natural birth, with the powers of genius.

Hence it does not follow that a person must be saved because he is born of the Spirit in Holy Baptism; just as a man must not rival the greatness of Napoleon or Washington, Homer or Shakspeare, because by nature a genius.

Nor does it follow that a person is not really born of the Spirit into the kingdom of Heaven by Baptism, because he lives in sin, and is lost; just as we cannot infer that a man is not by nature a genius, merely because he accomplishes nothing that is great and good, and lives in obscurity and vice.

The parallel is valid. The kingdom of grace is an order of

> "Some village Hampden, that with dauntless breast,
> The little tyrant of his fields withstood;
> Some mute, inglorious Milton here may rest,
> Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood."

life as real as the kingdom of nature. Natural birth is not a theory, not abstract doctrine, not a mere emotional process, but it is the real beginning of concrete natural life, comprehending body and soul. So is the new birth of the Spirit not a theory, not an invisible ideal transaction, but a transition from nature to grace, as real as the transition from the womb of the mother into the sphere of individual existence, and is therefore the real beginning of a new concrete spiritual life, which comprehends the body as well as the soul, and completes itself in the resurrection, as fallen natural life completes itself in death and the grave. In both we are passive. A child is begotten and born by the antecedent law and powers of nature. It is re-begotten and reborn by the antecedent law and powers of the Holy Ghost in the Church. Yet so soon as born it is met by the conditions of the ethical world. The design of natural birth will be realized if these conditions are met. So soon as reborn it is met by the conditions of the ethical world as these obtain in the sphere of grace. And if these conditions of grace are met, the design of the new birth of water and the Spirit will be realized in complete salvation.

The difficulty of appreciating the force of this analogy arises from the prevalence of a false idealistic habit of thought. Evangelical theology, so-called, has little or no faith in the reality of the Church, or in the reality of regeneration. Regeneration is regarded as merely a subjective change, a change in the general habit of feeling, thought, and of the will, produced by the Holy Ghost through the preaching of Bible doctrines, instead of a new creation in Christ, involving the entire man. And the will of God is regarded rather as an outside, immutable, mechanical force, than as a living, concrete, ethical power. So soon as the Church is seen to be a constitution more real than the constitution of nature, the birth of the Spirit to be more real and comprehensive than the birth of the flesh, and the new life in the second Adam to be more real than the old life in the first Adam, the difficulty disappears, and the analogy has the force of an argument as well as that of an illustration.

We do not wish to imply that the Confessions adopt this analogy. They confine themselves to a comparison of Baptism to the Word. We have added it in order to show that the Reformed doctrine is sustained and illustrated by the analogy of natural life no less than by that of the preaching of the gospel.

There are still two other points involved in the results of our inquiry that require elucidation. One relates to a false interpretation of the sixty-fifth question of the Heidelberg Catechism, which teaches that the Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and confirms it by the use of the Sacraments. The other is the difference between the Reformed doctrine of Baptism, and the *opus operatum* theory of the Roman Catholic Church. But as our investigation has already exceeded its intended limits, we waive the consideration of them, at least for the present.

CONCLUSION.

As stated at the outset, it has been our design to ascertain what is the Reformed doctrine concerning Holy Baptism, from a full and thorough examination of the Confessions of the Reformed Church.

It was not our design to show that the Reformed doctrine is in full accord with the doctrine as held during the first three or four centuries of the Church, or as taught in the New Testament. On these points we neither affirm, nor deny, nor imply anything. They lie beyond the range of our inquiry.

Nor do we wish to imply that the Reformed dogma is perfect; that the Church of the present, and the future, is slavishly bound to hold and teach neither more nor less than the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century held and taught; or that there is no room nor occasion for further progress in the knowledge of the truth concerning the Sacrament of Baptism; and that as psychological, exegetical and theological science advances in the order of legitimate development, informed by living faith in the incarnate Word, and guided by the light of history, the Protestant Church may not attain to a conception of Holy Baptism that will answer more fully to the New Testament idea than any that meets us in existing Confessions.

These points we do not touch. Nor is any view we may take of these questions inconsistent either with our design, or with the result of our investigation.

The simple and only question now before us is: what was the prevailing view of Baptism in the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century? That view we have drawn from the Reformed Confessions themselves, the most authoritative and satisfactory sources of information.

They teach as with one voice, that Holy Baptism, being the union by the power of the Word, of the thing signified with the sign, is the Sacrament of Regeneration; that in and through Baptism we receive forgiveness of sins, are ingrafted into Christ, and are thus made partakers of a new spiritual life by the power of the Holy Ghost; and that no one can have the assurance of sins forgiven, and peace with God, or can enter into the kingdom of Heaven, who refuses to be baptized.

This is the *Protestant* doctrine. It is the doctrine of the *Reformed* Church in all its branches. Nor is it contradicted by a single acknowledged formulary of faith.

Modern evangelical theology denies and repudiates this doctrine of the Reformed Church. It denies that Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration. It denies that there is an inward and necessary connection, effected by the Word of God, of the blood and Spirit of Christ, which is the thing signified, with the outward washing with consecrated water, which is the sign. It denies that in Baptism we are really ingrafted into Christ by the Holy Ghost, and thus have forgiveness of sins, and a new spiritual life, comprehending the entire man. This is to deny that Christ is true to Himself in His own living Institution; or that He really does by His spirit what He signifies by the outward transaction; and virtually resolves the Sacrament into a lifeless form, and an empty ceremony.

By such denial, modern evangelical theology shakes hands with the old anabaptistic heresy of the Reformation period, which the Reformed Confessions with one accord denounce; and convicts itself of being non-protestant and anti-protestant, non-reformed and anti-reformed. It affirms, in regard to Baptism, what the Reformed Confessions in most explicit terms

deny, and denies what they most solemnly affirm; yet plumes itself on this open hostility to the old faith, as being the badge of uncompromising fidelity to the Protestant Church.

Upon the unbelieving spirit that sees in Holy Baptism only an empty and inefficacious sign, and thus turns the acts of Jesus Christ into pantomine, the entire Reformed Church of the sixteenth century joins with the Confession of Scotland in pronouncing the condemnatory sentence: *Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, sacramenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus.*

Art. III.—GERMANIA.

BY SAMUEL V. MAYS, A. M., PHILADELPHIA.

"Omnia Roma cum pretio" became a fact in the history of the Imperial City, and with the departure of her virtue, integrity and character, the sovereignty of the world passed from her forever. Almost simultaneously with the advent of Christianity, and destined to become the true element of its development, a new people sprang into existence. A simple religion on the one hand, came forward to sweep away the magnificent creations of intellect and fancy; on the other, the forests of Central Europe sent forth their hordes of barbarians to assume the control of temporal affairs. The two met and moved on together, and a regeneration of the world began. The Sun of Antiquity set, and the night of the Middle Ages covered the world, but it was the darkness which precedes the brightness of the coming day.

Without any clearly-defined geographical limits, Germania was the name given by the ancient Romans to that part of northern and central Europe inhabited by many tribes under different governments, but whose similarity of feature, language and custom, proclaimed them all of the same race. Their first

appearance commonly dates about a century before the Christian era, but it was not until the Roman Empire had seen the world stoop before the throne of her Cæsars, that "She of the Danube and the Northern Seas" arose to perform her allotted part. Dazzled with the glory of Rome, attractive even in her degradation, it is difficult for us at first to reconcile ourselves with the immediate consequences of the migration of the Northern nations. Yearly the Nile overflows its banks, but as its waters return to their accustomed channel and luxuriant vegetation covers the plain, the only means that can save Egypt from a burning waste, are found to have been deposited by this apparent calamity. No less beneficial to society was that flood, which, issuing from Germania, changed ancient civilization, the work of Grecian mind and Roman arms, into semi-barbarism. In its desolating course it deposited the seeds of a new life.

Germania is not a continuation of the previous order of history—Rome, Greece, Persia, India and China. These were, so to speak, the steps of society in a certain direction, but with Rome the limit of that course was reached. The introduction of the Teutonic nations broke the link, not abruptly, but still completely, and changed that course. Henceforth society advances under new influences, and the Middle Ages form the transition period of the Ancient Historical world into the Modern.

As the German *spirit* differed fundamentally from those preceding, so also the manner of its introduction differed from all previous conquests. The subjugation of a foreign power by Rome's legions was immediately followed by a complete system of law, determined in no degree by the institutions it displaced, and with no other end than to direct the resources of the conquered people to the advancement of the Imperial City. Germania had no distinct and established form of government to extend, nor even a political centre whence radiated law, and to which could be directed the fruits of the conquest. She was rather an element introduced *into*, and assimilated by a decaying society for its reorganization. In fact, she can be said to exist only so far as she comes into contact with foreign nations.

Her history only commences from the time she loses her name. Her *spirit* was the plastic power that developed a new historical era; hence the *universality* of its genius and the absence of any complete system of polity.

What now is the distinguishing feature of this *spirit* of History? True Liberty: not that freedom from restraint which obtains among savages in the absence of established government, but the recognition of the individual, with inalienable rights and privileges, anterior to, and the great object and end of the State. This principle never appears in the ancient social system. On the contrary, under every form of government, the citizen exists only as the property of the State. The elections on the Campus Martius and the Senate Chamber, resonant with the eloquence of the Conscript Fathers, were not the means by which the individual maintained his rights. Senatus Populusque Romanus received the homage of three continents, but in all its splendid triumphs, the Roman finds his only boast in the glory of her, for whose advancement his freedom was sacrificed. Athens, synonym for refinement and superiority in literature and art, Sparta, forever an example of patriotic self-devotion and by-word for virtue, are the desperate struggles for the same end. The oligarchy became a democracy, but the δῆμοι were still slaves to the very power they wielded. Even here the necessity of the State demanded the institution of ostracism, which took away whatever of freedom a share in the government bestowed on the citizen. The history of Sparta shows the true development of the ancient spirit divested of all the magnificence, and the attractive forms which surround it in the Roman Republic.

In the latter, there is much that bears the semblance of real liberty, but examine it carefully and this likeness vanishes. Did the Licinian Rogations, called forth by the necessary conflict between two classes, virtually abolishing all differences between Plebeian and Patrician, and extending to the former an equal share of political power, become the source of as much freedom as the summoning of the "three estates of France by Phillip the Fair," or the "Mad Parliament" of Simon de

Montfort, which proved the germ of the English House of Commons? The Empire followed the Republic naturally, for the Tribunes and Consuls were nourished by the same meat on which Great Cæsar fed. Beautiful and stately was the temple of Roman liberty, but its priests burned on its altars strange fires, unchanged through Kingdom, Republic and Empire.

Ancient History has the form, but not the essence of liberty. To supply this, to abolish the idea that great wealth and power of the State, whether obtained by foreign conquest or internal servitude, was the object of society, to make individual prosperity that object, in short, to reverse the whole ancient order, this was the work of Germania. To this work she brought no stores of knowledge, no traditions of mighty deeds, no discoveries in science and art, but each warrior, as he left that "northern hive," carried within himself principles of freedom guarantied by custom and nourished by his religion, which were as necessary to him as the air he breathed, and which he infused into every society he entered.

That which preserved the primitive independence of the German as well in his native forests as in his absorption by the Roman world, was the influence of nobility, religion and custom. The Roman Historian, in a few short chapters, gives their general character in the picture he offers for the emulation of his countrymen. We see in these Annals the brightest civil and domestic virtues shining forth with increased lustre from amid their barbarous surroundings, a simplicity of character and independence of spirit combined with unity of feeling and sentiment, a strong and unyielding idea of honor, a bravery that looked alike upon victory and death, and, above all, the rude outlines of a system of polity without the panoply of power based upon the freest theory of representative government. These were the germs, surrounded indeed by much that is offensive to civilized society, which under foreign influence developed into all that we admire and cherish in the social institutions of the present day.

This development, or the growth of Germania, manifests itself under two distinct forms. German institutions on the Conti-

nent, and German institutions in England, though starting from the same source, diverge in their expansion, until their kindred can hardly be recognized. German nobility, religion and custom were present in both forms, but led to different results.

While the nobility received all honor and influence, it was honor and influence gained only by merit and subject to certain conditions. There was a mutual dependence between chief and follower which was founded on individual freedom. Feudalism, its direct result in history, clearly proves this. The relation of lord and vassal, though drawing oppression and slavery in its train, was the first step of society from the strong central power of Rome towards true liberty. Feudalism strengthened the principles of private right, because its very life arose from them. Henceforth the existence of the individual *had to be recognized* by the State. The aristocracy of modern European society is not then a continuation of the Patrician order, but is clearly of Germanic origin, and as such was necessary to the growth of freedom.

The religion of the whole Teutonic race, with all its mystic rites and ceremonies, its savage character in strange contrast with the refinement of Grecian mythology, nourished the same spirit of individual freedom. There was no Jupiter Stator, protecting deity of some particular nation, no angry Juno, cherishing a lasting resentment against the rival of her favorite, but Odin, warrior God, sat at his festal board, and welcomed each brave warrior from the battle-field to the pleasures of Walhalla. But this religion exerted its influence only until the northern nations came into contact with the Roman world. Then Christianity superseded it, and in the light of its doctrines the genius of the German *spirit* unfolded and assumed universal sway.

The corresponding relation between Christianity and the Christian Church on the one hand and Germania on the other, was absolutely necessary in the reformation of the world. They formed a complete whole, and without either, the great plan of universal history would have been imperfect. Christianity (the

soul of the religion as distinct from the temporal institution, the Christian Church of the Middle Ages), while it transformed and civilized the German element in common with all mankind, at the same time gave to its peculiar ideas of liberty a new life. It sanctified those principles which ruled among the barbarous nations of the North, rendering them imperishable and all-powerful in the history of the world.

That, however, which more immediately affected the organization of society after the downfall of the Roman Empire, was German custom. Customs were the laws, not written on tables, the work of legislative assemblies or the arbitrary decrees of some powerful chief, but the generally-received methods of administering public affairs and private justice as common sense and their ideas of equity dictated. This was all that confronted the wisdom of ages, the combined product of Grecian and Roman mind. Here stood the *Justinian Code*, replete with learning and surrounded with the majestic form of authority; there were a few traditions of savage origin, but of matchless intrinsic value. In such an unequal contest we cannot expect to see immediately the full extent to which the new spirit influenced existing institutions. Just and equitable as German customs were, grounded on a world wide basis and meeting an approving response in every human heart, they had still much to acquire, and many changes to undergo before they could become practical in their new sphere. In fact, to the degree that institutions were deep-seated and fixed, Germania yielded, and those countries which had been thoroughly Romanized received comparatively little of the form of German polity.

The first definite results during the fifth and sixth centuries, the Salic, Burgundian, Ripuarian and Visigothic laws plainly evince their barbaric origin, but at the same time already show the latinizing tendency of the Christian Church—that living bond between the two conflicting principles. Popular legislative assemblies became less frequent; the unequal distribution of the fruits of the conquest created new centres of attraction, which increased in strength by constant accession; the stronger became still stronger by the absorption of the weaker; the in-

dividual liberty of Germania found itself gradually losing power until it almost disappeared. Conditioned as society then was, this in a certain measure was unavoidable. That spirit of independence, which, in the narrow confines of its early home was checked into moderation by necessity, would undoubtedly have culminated in anarchy and misrule while revelling in the profuse bounties of nature which met the barbarians on their entrance into the fruitful plains of Southern Europe. Here then is the proper place of the temporal power of the Christian Church. She formed the bridge over the vast gulf between Rome and Germania, between Ancient and Modern History. Contradictory as it may seem, she preserved the German spirit and prepared it for society. Independent of her aid, the invasion of the German tribes would have destroyed without affording the means of reconstruction. Wonderful and mighty were the deeds of that sword granted by God to the Pope, "die Christenheit zu beschirme," but centuries ago its work was accomplished, and now in the twilight of its departed glory wanders Pio Nono, grasping after the fleeting shadows of vanished greatness, while the thunders of the Vatican fall harmless on the great adversary of his domains, Victor Emanuel.

While European society in its internal existence experienced the gradual union of German custom with Roman law, its external life suffered corresponding changes. The great monarchies founded by the German nations during the fifth and sixth centuries endured but a short time. There was nothing fixed and firm, but a constant ebb and flow as the mighty waves settled to their proper level. This level is almost gained when the diffused German element is combined in the Frankish Empire of Charlemagne. The transformation of this element had now become complete, and though during its period of education much that was desirable perished, yet it succeeded in disenthralling man and establishing society on a new basis. The dissolution of the Empire of Charlemagne marks the beginning of distinct nationalities which the Crusades render still more distinct. The modern nations, France, Spain and Germany,

begin to determine themselves. In the growth of these nations we see how far the German spirit rules.

Under the protection of the Clergy, Roman law retained its position against many customs which were almost indispensable to the rapid development of free constitutions. The States General, the Cortez, the Diet, all representative legislative bodies with more or less power, while the result of the spirit of liberty, were still too much invested with the remains of the ancient system to admit of a free expansion. Though slow, the growth of this spirit is undoubted. France, first kingdom, then republic, now empire, has witnessed the most violent struggles against power, and now, in spite of its name, the government of Napoleon III. is more limited by conceded popular rights, more determined by the popular will and wants of the individual, than was ever experienced even under the rule of the twelve hundred. Spain, as if still under the spell of Moorish enchantment, forgets in her sleep her primitive glory and her noble origin. From the ruins of the German empire—the effect of the unrestrained license of her ancient independence—starts Austria, proud and tyrannical, but even she cannot resist the march towards freedom, and the reorganization of her government in 1861, with its two houses of parliament, opens a fair prospect to the conglomerate elements of her nationality. The extension of the electorate of Brandenburg by Frederick William, and its subsequent rise to the first rank of nations under him (who, during a seven years war, a century ago, fought summer campaigns against combined Europe, skirmished with the French wits in winter, and in 1864 suffered apotheosis at the hands of Carlyle), the free kingdom of Prussia bears the fullest development of German custom on the Continent. Constitutional monarchy, power on the one hand clearly defined and checked, with every means of self-extension removed, but fully conscious of its true source and dependence; on the other, a new relation of the subject to the sovereign, invested indeed with much of the old tyrannical spirit, but having in its nature the principles of growth, the interests of the citizen shaping the fortune of the State,—this is

the history of Germania, the legitimate fruit of her teachings. "Nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas" is not less descriptive of the royal power of Europe at the present time, than when it was recorded of the old Teutonic kings by Tacitus.

But the second form under which Germania exists in Modern History, has deviated less from the tendencies of its principles, and the English Constitution is the perfect fruit of the German *spirit.* Here the invasion of the Saxons and Danes was not an infiltration of a foreign element into an established society. It was rather a change of *position* than *condition*, that the Germans experienced, and German customs developed into the English government almost exclusive of every other element. To restrain the spirit of independence from running into its anarchical extreme, it was necessary here, as on the Continent, that the Roman system should exert its influence. The Heptarchy had indeed been changed into a single kingdom by the superior skill and prudence of Egbert, but it required the strong central government introduced by the Norman conquest to destroy forever the power of those mighty chiefs, and thus render England a united people. But as if to preserve the Germanic character unmixed, Roman institutions were brought to bear externally and through a people whose origin and early history were the same as those of the Anglo-Saxons. The Norman conquest introduced into England that system which had already resulted from the union of the Roman law with German custom; hence, though the revolution was thorough, completely setting aside the old institutions, even adopting a new language, thus separating still further the conquered from the conquerors, there was a sympathy between the two arising out of their common origin, which eventually overcame all opposition, and succeeded in abolishing the foreign spirit when its mission was ended. In the inner life of society German met German, and, in spite of opposing influences, the triumph of this element became inevitable. The English Government, then, in all its relations, is the embodiment of the German spirit. The limited royal power, the representative legislative assembly, the nobles and commons, the common law with that jealous guardian of

civil liberty, trial by jury, all these have their prototypes in the customs of the ancient Saxons.

There is a fact running through English history, which, while a proof of the practical common sense of English mind, marks conclusively the growth of those principles which the barbaric invasion transplanted to this little isle. From the time that William the Conqueror swore with hand on sacred relics, before Bishop Fritrik, to preserve inviolable the laws of his Saxon predecessor, through each successive step, down to the latest extension of privilege by the House of Commons, every innovation and revolution have been undertaken not for the purpose of pulling down, but in order to define and defend rights and privileges as ancient as the nation itself. The citizen in all his relations was governed by the customs of his ancestors; hence the external life of society was determined by its internal condition. As constitutional monarchy is the present result of the *first* form of German development, so constitutional liberty, that liberty founded on justice and right, that right and justice defined by German custom, that custom defended by German valor, is the consequence of the second. The English constitution and "Matre pulchra filia pulchrior," the American Republic, are the true representative policies of the *spirit* of Modern History.

"The liberty of the Germans is more vigorous than the tyranny of the Arsacidæ" is the testimony of the Roman Historian, and the nineteenth century verifies the record of the first. The same power which prepared a grave in the heart of the Teutobergen forests for Varrus and his three legions, humbling the pride of Cæsar, and proclaiming thus far and no further to the triumphant march of the first Rome, pronounced the doom of the second in the victory of the Reformation. Its bright deeds are written in the glory of Morgarten and Waterloo, the Thermopyla and Marathon of our times, and its hand deposited the last remains of the ancient system in the sarcophagus of St. Helena.

The imperishability of Ilium has passed to her successor, and though finding no place among the nations of the earth whose

power, dominion and mighty works shed an all-absorbing splendor around their names, Germania still lives and grows with constantly increasing strength. The finger of the Almighty God traced the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights for mankind in German institutions and German characters, and hand-in-hand with Christianity they have gone forth regenerating the body social and politic. In the uprearing of mighty nationalities, in the growth of all free constitutions, in the transformation of old governments, in the abolition of political systems under whatever form they embodied the *ancient spirit*, in the union of royal power with the rights and prerogatives of the citizen, in the laws which govern the intercourse of nation with nation, as well as those which rule the relations between individuals and between the governed and the governing, in every bulwark of liberty, in the wealth and prosperity consequent to individual freedom, here is the history of Germania written that "he who runs may read." As modern German mind rules the world of intellect and thought, so the universal empire of the political spirit of ancient Germany can claim with more justice now, than when national pride and arrogance dictated,

"*Alles Erdreich Ist Oestreich Unterthan.*"

Art. IV.—DIVINE REVELATION.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

It is not possible to reach any full apprehension of the Holy Scriptures, except as we take into consideration the mystery of divine revelation, which is not to be regarded as identical with these Scriptures themselves. This course is made necessary by the fact, which all will acknowledge, that the Scriptures must rest upon an antecedent self-utterance of God, in the proper apprehension of which under inspiration they themselves come to have their existence. Without God's manifestation of himself first, how could any one ever feel challenged either to receive or to declare his word? Without an objective self-communication of God in some form to the creature, how could seer or prophet ever be called or qualified either to see or to speak? As in the natural, sensation and perception and conscious thought refer at once to an external, objective world of nature, in the presence of which they come into activity; so in the supernatural, neither faith, nor inspiration, nor religious life even, however native to the constitution of man's being, can have any proper reality without the presence of an objective supernatural world opening itself before man in God's revelation of himself.

We are speaking here, of course, of God's self-revelation to the creature, not of that inner revelation, in which, as personal, God ever knows himself in his own consciousness. This latter is unconditioned, or rather eternally self-conditioned by the very nature of God himself. The former, however, must be conditioned on the one hand by the object which the divine will has in view, and on the other, by the peculiar moral constitution of man to whom the divine manifestation directs it-

self. The revelation of God, as outward merely, confronting the order of our life from quite another and foreign sphere, can be nothing but magical wonderwork or transient theophany, unless the outward manifestation in some way finds lodgment in man,—unless it meets in him some point of contact, where it may be apprehended as an utterance of God. If on the outside entirely of man's moral being, or if breaking in upon this being in such form as to violate or set aside its essential law, the manifestation may be an utterance of God indeed, but no revelation of him to us. It is but a subversion of the very idea of man's being, as involving conscious moral determination, to imagine that God may use it as a passive instrument, and at the same time expect to work out for it or in it, without moral mediation, a knowledge of himself. For man this would be no knowledge whatever, for the process through which by such means it might be supposed to be gained, would stand in direct, irreconcilable antagonism with the essential law of all intellection in his moral constitution. The outward manifestation of God, in this case, would be but mirrored into him and reflected from him, as the sky in the unconscious depths and from the tranquil surface of the passive water. It could have no ethical import for him, and could in no sense be regarded as entering into the order of his life or history. Hence we have said that the revelation of God, as coming immediately from him, is conditioned not only by the object which the divine will has in view, but also by the moral constitution of man to whom it is directed.

The creation indeed is no revelation of God, except as there lies in it the possibility of becoming conscious of him as its creator. Day unto day may utter speech, and night unto night may show knowledge, yet all this must be to the creature as though is were not, if he have no ear in which the swelling voice may be syllabled into consciousness, and no reason in which such show of knowledge may be grasped and permanently held. What would be the whole world of nature, with its wondrous compass of activities, with its vast manifoldness of forms, with its ten thousand utterances from above and from beneath, what

would it all be to the creature, if, without any self-conscious and self-determining personality, he should come in and go out, through birth and death, incapacitated to know either himself or his surroundings, moved by blind instincts from the cradle to the grave through a pathway unseen and unsought, not knowing the whence or the whither of his strange pilgrimage?

Not such, however, is the result of God's creative activity. The order of the finite does not live and move and have its being in God in such a blind and passive way. At its summit, it reaches beyond the purely physical into a moral world, in which it comes to the power of self-knowing and self-determining. In the presence of human thought, in the whole mystery of man's intellectual life, and in the bosom of his self-determining will, the otherwise dark solitude of nature is illumined. Here it awakens into a new life as it comes to a self-realization in man's being, and enters upon a process, not of blind movement in the way of physical organization and development, but of free, moral activity in the way of history, unfolding all the vast organisms which constitute the ethical life of the race. But even beyond this, the whole order of creation in man comes to stand face to face with God. Man is created after God's image; and as he is conscious of himself and of the world, in the mutual relations of which thought and will continually realize themselves, so has he a God-consciousness, in the activity of which, as confronted with God's revelation around him and in him through the order of nature and the order of history, his knowledge of self and the world is entered by a knowing of God, which forms, we may say the base-element of his spiritual being, interfusing the life of thought with the life of religion. How can it be conceived as possible, then, that any outward manifestation of God should come to assert its presence in the world by setting aside at the start the moral constitution of that world in man, sinking it back into the sphere of the merely passive out of whose darkness it had already emerged by the creative act of God? In such case the supernatural would be but contranatural, standing in direct an-

tagonism with the whole order of history, never entering it, and therefore proving a failure as regards the only conceivable object of its manifestation.

We are far from maintaining here that God's self-revelation does not originate wholly in a sphere transcending the life of the world. Its source and content are, of course, God himself, and both alike above nature and above reason; yet the divine manifestation is not in such a sense contranatural and contrarational as not to be able to find lodgment through moral mediation in these spheres. Our reason is itself relative and in process, not absolute. Its horizon, its scope of vision, is limited, ever widening as reason develops itself in its own exercise. A manifestation of God may therefore be above reason in its relativeness as possessed by man while it is not and cannot be without self-contradiction in opposition to reason viewed as absolute. The orb of nature also is not so hedged in by creative act as to have no point of possible contact for the supernatural, no point of entrance, as it moves on in its relative process towards the realization of its own divine idea, for God's self-manifestation not only to but also in its very order of life.

While thus admitting the reality of God-consciousness as a characteristic element of man's being, which may be, and indeed is, met by a supernatural world in the bosom of which alone it can find its true exercise and proper completeness, it must not be supposed for a moment that this peculiar consciousness can of itself construct the supernatural, or come to any proper development without its presence. As in the lower sphere of our life there are capacities which by the very organism of our physical being are turned toward an eternal world, but which, without the presence of such world, can come to no exercise or development, as, for example, the eye for light, the ear for sound, so the human spirit in its own nature looks out toward the supernatural, but its capacity in this direction must be met before it can come to have proper contents or activity—just as the eye must be met by light before vision has any reality. The eye makes not the light, but only comes to see in the light. The God-consciousness makes not the illumining divine manifesta-

tion, but forms that point where this manifestation may come to assert its presence and reality, and thus find lodgment in the bosom of our life. We may say then that God's self-manifestation looks to that capacity of man's spirit in which it may find the possibility of being received and of thus becoming morally effective. It breaks in upon the world from its own height of glory, not to overthrow or overwhelm the order of nature and history, but to exalt and perfect the same, as man by communion therewith comes to apprehend its mystery, its moral meaning, and its content of life. It comes neither as a magic theophany from without, nor as an ideal myth rising up into fancied actualness from within out of the depths of human aspirations, but as a real, though supernatural fact, entering and authenticating itself in history, linking itself on to its onward flow, and unfolding its content to the unfolding receptivity and apprehension of the human spirit.

It is necessary here, however, before we can fully bring into view the moral aim of God's self-manifestation as conditioned by the ethical constitution of man, to speak of the fall, in and by which man's whole being has been deranged and darkened. The moral process, which lay before the finite will as a created power of self-determination and therefore of course not at the outset already determined by God, would have been met, we may suppose, if the human will had determined the divine as the centre and law of its life, by a more rapid and full unfolding of God's self-communication. There would have been then no self-constructed barrier against the same, no self-defacement of the soul by which the truth and wholeness of the divine manifestation could be broken up, disintegrated, distorted, and in the end lost. The human spirit, like the Eden around it, would then have been open for the incoming supernatural light and glory. The Logos, as the infinite source of light to the whole creation, would not have shined through a suppressing darkness, as coming into the world. But man's fall through transgression so covered the whole compass of his being and history as to require not only a special revelation of God, but also such a purification of man's spiritual capacities as to ena-

ble him to recognize the divine presence itself amidst his own darkness and that of the world. God's manifestation, therefore, while having in view ultimately a full self-communication to the creature, so directed itself in the way of redemption as to awaken and develop and purify man's capacity to receive the unfolding mystery. It enclosed within itself this important moral aim, and hence we find it adapting itself to the conditions of human life and history, and reaching out in real progress through a twofold process, as on the one hand God addresses himself to man, and as on the other, man's susceptibility for the divine is challenged, aroused, strengthened, and purified. In other words the God-consciousness, as by sin disturbed, disorganized, and darkened, must be enlightened and purified. Having no power to elevate itself out of the fallen condition of human life, it has at the same time also no power to meet with undistorted vision the supernatural mystery which in God's manifestation is made to confront it. Divine revelation, therefore, as it progressively unfolds itself, keeps steadily in view, since it cannot truly reach man except through moral mediation, this object, that it may through man's capacity awakened and energized by it, become apprehended and felt.

From this it is evident that the revelation in order to become in any proper moral sense a reality in human life or history, must consist not only in an *outward manifestation* confronting man from the supernatural world, but also and at the same time in an *inward inspiration* through which the outward manifestation may come to a full and true authentication of itself in human apprehension. These two factors are absolutely essential to constitute the reality of a divine revelation. What would the outward manifestation be if alone, and beyond any true human apprehension, but a dazzling, bewildering theophany; a magic display of unintelligible wonders, with no moral meaning, and having no possible lodgment in history; a transient meteor flashing through the darkness and nothing more? And again, in what would the weak efforts of man's sin-disturbed God-consciousness, if not confronted with its true and proper content from the spiritual world and at the same time if

not, in connection with this, divinely illumined, in what would they result, but in fastastic dreamy myths, mistaking and perverting the whole reality of the divine? It is just this that we behold in heathenism, where these two necessary factors of divine revelation are wanting. Here the human spirit, moved by the religious impulse essential to it, and unable under sin to realize the measure of divine manifestation confronting it in nature and history, constructs an unreal supernatural world which is related to the order of history only magically, having no proper moral meaning or effect. The whole movement swings between the formation of myths and their dissolution by philosophy, while the sense of dissatisfaction is only deepened as the spirit sinks back into a helpless cry for deliverance and light. In Judaism, however, we find quite the opposite of all this. Here the whole revelation is moral and not magical from beginning to end. It enters really into the movement of history, embodies itself in institutions and forms of law, and unfolds its power in a real historical way from age to age.

These two factors of divine revelation, to which we have referred, viz., the *outward manifestation*, and *inward inspiration*, although both alike supernatural, yet so connect themselves with the order of our life in the bosom of nature as to become themselves historical. The divine manifestation progresses, unfolding itself step by step towards its consummation. It gives us no arbitrary, random play of supernatural forces, now brilliant and dazzling, and now dim and shadowy, and always magical and outside of the orbit of history. The progress is such that each succeeding manifestation is linked with what has gone before as a fuller unfolding of its meaning, widening thus the horizon of man's God-consciousness, challenging a profounder exercise of his capacities God-ward, and pouring into the surrounding darkness a larger measure of light in which the whole process more clearly reveals itself as prophetic of the sublime issue toward which it is moving. This process, although at every point divinely ordered, has not its orbit separate and beyond the sphere of our life. It so interpenetrates this latter as to adapt itself to the whole progressive development of humani-

ty, unfolding to the stimulated apprehension thereof more and more of its content, meeting its awakened wants and susceptibilities, and thus continually lodging itself in the very bosom of the world's history. It is just this, as we have already intimated, which characterizes Judaism, the special sphere of such manifestations, as over against Heathenism, where everything supernatural assumes a visionary, fantastic, mythical character, without moral content, and hence without any positive moral discipline.

When the outward manifestation takes the form of what may be called a fact of nature, it so transcends what nature itself can exhibit as to challenge at once marked attention, and at the same time hedges the mind in to an acknowledgment of its inexplicable character upon the base of nature merely, so that if there be present in the one addressed by such fact any susceptibility for the supernatural, this may be aroused and excited into activity toward an appreciation and solution of the mystery. And again, the mysterious nature-fact in which God comes to manifest his presence stands not alone, but connects itself with whatever of manifestation has preceded it, and also with what is to follow, and moreover encloses a moral significance in relation to the end which it has in view as well as to the historical condition of the person or persons addressed by it: and all this becomes in the end a bosom of illumination in which the apprehension of the mystery finds itself corroborated and firmly certified. Thus it is also that the manifestation, although confined to the physical, comes to articulate to man's apprehension not merely God's presence in the way of supernatural power, but in some measure, according to the aim of the special manifestation itself, it declares his will, that is, what he is and what he means by such presence. The fact is not a mere wonderwork, but one which has moral significance, a teleological fact, a miracle replete with ethical content.

In the interest of skepticism it has been held that the physical world is one in which there is a sublime presence of law, which makes it of necessity an unchangeable order, so that any nature-fact not of such order must be such a transcendence of

the same as either to be denied because bringing the divine author of the physical and the supposed divine author of the miracle into direct antagonism, or to be explained away upon merely natural grounds. The very point which we have in consideration is by this view entirely neglected, viz., that already the order of nature as in the divine mind has been violated by the presence of sin in the sphere of human life, and that now, in view of the fact that man's entire capacity of knowing God is darkened, the revelation of nature after its own order is inadequate to give a clear articulation of the divine amidst such moral darkness, and must in the interest of redemption be so strengthened by the entrance of a mystery into its own sphere which shall, just by its transcendence of nature, bring into the sphere of man's possible vision, as divinely illumined, what shall necessitate an acknowledgment of the idea of God to solve its mystery and grasp its meaning. The very objection of skepticism is here but an evidence of the necessity of the special manifestation, showing as it does how prone the human consciousness is to rest in the merely natural without any proper acknowledgment of the possible presence of the supernatural in it.

It is evident, however, that God's self-manifestation can come to no adequate completion in the sphere of the physical alone. In the order of nature itself, the creative process does not consummate itself in the physical, but reaches beyond into the moral, the sphere of history, which rests however upon the physical as its necessary base. So in the process of divine manifestation, the physical sphere only forms the base for the higher and historical, where the will of God, where indeed the whole compass of his moral attributes, may find utterance. We must have, therefore, if the idea of God is to find any full lodgment in our consciousness, not only supernatural facts in the sphere of the physical, but also supernatural *historical* facts, in which the divine manifestation may show itself. Both are inseparably connected, and continually penetrate each other, so that in the very order of our life we have another and supernatural order authenticating its presence, we have a history

within history. God, in his redemptive process of self-manifestation to man who is unable in his sinful condition to give to his capacity Godward any proper or sure content gathered from the data of history in the sphere only of this world, brings into history, as into nature, supernatural historical facts which not only challenge his profoundest attention, but excite him to a solution of their mystery and meaning, and which as before, transcending the natural order, hedge him in to an acknowledgment of the divine presence therein and also to a certain conviction of God's special moral attributes which there come to utterance. Here again we have a process in which the various parts are in organic relation and which holds within itself the idea which the whole movement is to realize; and this idea, as controlling it from beginning to end, is in the process brought before the awakened apprehension of mankind with ever-increasing clearness. In relation to this idea, which, as we shall hereafter see, is the Incarnation of the Word, the facts are at once historical and at the same time vast prophetic types and pregnant symbols, which when viewed in the light of the completed manifestation are seen to belong to that great mystery, which as coming into the world opened its own pathway through that world's darkness with such streams of dawning light.

So also as regards the other factor of divine revelation, viz., *inspiration*, there is nothing magical or arbitrary. There is and must be here also a moral mediation. The essential law of human apprehension cannot be mechanically set aside or overthrown, and man's spirit become a mere instrument wrought upon by an external force which in no way truly enters the moral constitution which it is to effect. From what has already been said in reference to the moral aim of the outward manifestation this must be apparent. The general subjective base of inspiration is man's God-consciousness, his capacity Godward. This is, of course, affected by sin which covers the whole sphere of man's knowing. Confronting this higher power of knowing, as darkened by sin, the outward manifestation comes, arousing it into activity, and directing its concentrated attention upon the mystery which it presents. This,

however, is not of itself enough. In immediate connection with the outward manifestation there must be also a supernatural inward illumination, for the reception of which the aroused capacity is prepared, and in which the apprehension as held to the definite manifestation confronting it, becomes assured of its own wholeness and certain truth. The illumination, although in every sense supernatural, yet enters within the human spirit, and through the enlightened and enlivened activities of the same as directed to the manifestation, accomplishes a true and supernaturally evidenced apprehension therein.

There are of course different forms of inward illumination; yet all are of such a character as to find a real base of connection in the peculiar moral organism of the individual, and are not magical, nor unconditioned by the outward manifestation which serves at the same time as stimulant, and limit, and attestation. No psychological system can well neglect those mysterious soul-instincts which in forms of dreams and visions and presentiments assert their presence amidst the surrounding physical and moral world. Although passive and not properly within the sphere of active, conscious thought, yet when met by their proper counterpart in actual facts, they take in conjunction with these in the consciousness the form of solemn attestations. In other words, there is a sense of mutual recognition, as it were, in which the vision and facts are seen at once to flow together as from the self-same source beyond the ordinary sphere of the soul's activity. Here there is found, we think, a natural psychological point of connection for that supernatural illumination which assumes the form of dream and vision, but which is always limited and controlled within the outward manifestation which must serve continually to evidence the reality and truthfulness of the resultant revelation. At least we can feel that an apprehension of this kind, effected in such form by supernatural illumination, does not violate the essential structure of our psychical nature.

But beyond these lower forms of inward illumination, there are in the human spirit certain powers, which, under an

aroused activity, under the breathings of some mysterious presence, bring into the consciousness a wondrous light,—a rapid combination of its elements of thought, felt not to have been self-originated. A new comprehensive truth flashes upon the view, filling the soul with illumination in which the temporal becomes almost translucent with the eternal, in which there is, what Coleridge calls, an "etherial intuition," "a flash of revealing light," "a glorious birth of the God-like within us." This natural inspiration, which makes genius itself a prophet of nature,—a sibyl, revealing mysteries which flood the soul with enlivening recognitions of its own strength and glory and destiny, whose voice "wins not by words of rhetoric"—

> "Lip-blossoms breathing perishable sweets;
> But by the power of the informing Word
> Roll sounding onward through a thousand years
> Her deep prophetic bodements,"

this, "the vision and the faculty divine," what is it, but a prefiguration, so to speak,—a semblance and seeking,—an *analagon* of that higher, supernatural, prophetic illumination which here finds a point of connection, but which in full union with the outward divine self-manifestation, carries what otherwise might be viewed as only the creation of imagination into the sphere of certain historical reality. This *prophetic inspiration*, finding a point of entrance in man without making him a mere passive instrument, and energizing to the highest degree the whole capacity of thought and intuition within him, is itself however confined to the outward divine manifestation, and is on every side conditioned by it. The manifestation being progressive, the inspiration is also. While of course infallible in its sphere, it is yet relative and not absolute. It cannot transcend the outward manifestation to which it is linked, and only when the manifestation reaches its consummation with the accompanying inspiration, can we speak of an absolute revelation of God. This is reached in Christ, where there is the full self-manifestation of God, and at the same time the very fulness of the indwelling Spirit. Here God is fully declared (ἐξαγεσθαι), and the God-consciousness of the human carried to

its very highest potence in his person. God spake in the prophets in fragments (πολυμερως), and with manifoldness of application (πολυτροπως), to each successive age, but in these last days spake in a *Son*, *absolutely*, for he was the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person. (Hebrews i. 1–2.)

In saying that God's self-manifestation is progressive, and that while unfolding itself, the capacity to receive it upon the part of man is thereby strengthened, purified, and enlarged, we have of course assumed that the whole movement has within itself a certain aim. This aim can be none other than that of history also, which is itself revelation as the unfolding of the divine purpose in the forms of human thought and will. It were strange indeed that the creation in its formation should manifest a wondrous order and symmetry, and yet that in its movement toward its own proper fulness, under the divine love, it should become a mere play of random forces with no meaning, and of course with no possibly intelligible issue. We are necessitated to assume, in view of the acknowledgment of God, that the creation has meaning in its process, as having its ground of being and continuance in Him. It has some issue towards which it looks. But here, as before, we cannot conceive that man is to be driven on unconsciously toward such issue, as though it were something not to be wrought out within the sphere of his life. He cannot be forced on toward the end, whatever that may be, by blind fate or blind instincts. If so, then the world to reach its proper completion musk sink down into the merely mechanical, or physical or instinctive from the sublime height of reason and will in which its creation was crowned by Jehovah. Such a completion would be like that of a plant blossoming into a stone. Such a completion of the world-process would be its incompletion, would be but an acknowledgment of its failure after all, and man's redemption would be made only the evisceration of the very content of his moral being. The moral aim, for such there must be, of divine revelation as constituted by the two factors, outward manifestation and inward inspiration, and as itself in the sphere of his-

tory, is both to bring home clearly and surely to man's consciousness the idea of God, and with this the divine will and purpose in the whole order of history, in the bosom of which he has his being, and also at the same time so to release him from the law of sin and death, and so to quicken him as that the entire possibilities of his being, as in the divine mind, may reach out to complete realization.

Such divine purpose can only be grasped by us as it unfolds itself and comes to its completion; yet to answer the ends of a positive and conscious process in such direction, which is necessary to a moral nature, there must be a continuous assertion of the presence and general scope of the divine purpose, in which the reason and will and faith of mankind may find themselves challenged to see and act and adore. We may therefore, and indeed must, expect that at the very outset, divine revelation will hold out before man the great process and issue in and toward which his life is called freely to direct itself,—that it will confront him with a divine utterance which shall serve to challenge his faith, illumine his darkness, condition his activity, and at the same time, while meeting his wants and supplying strength to his weakness, keep firmly and steadily before him what he must acknowledge as the profound overture whose full compass of meaning will only be grasped when it reaches its completion in that great work of which to him it is itself the introduction.

This which seems so necessary, is just what meets us at the opening of the Old Testament, as the historical record of the divine revelation, accomplished, as we have said, in history by supernatural divine outward manifestation, and by supernatural inward human inspiration. In this historical record, as well as in living institutions of history and in the individual moral nature, the revelation took permanent form from age to age, and was held before the consciousness in its various steps, and continued within the scope of man's vision, so that each manifestation as succeeding the other might open up to the apprehension that content which man's susceptibility had not as yet found itself adequate to grasp.

Here then, in this historical record, at the very base of history, we have man presented before us made in the image of God, with the natural and supernatural worlds surrounding him, and beginning the unfolding of all his powers with the divine will uttering itself as that which he should freely determine to be the law of life. In view of the mystery of sin already an accomplished fact in the world of angelic intelligence, the will of God, as that which should govern the human will in the moral process before it, but govern it as we have said through its own free determination, uttered itself in a negative command in which man was warned against the threatening temptation and the terrible issue. Notwithstanding this, the possibility of the fall became an actual fact, and now the divine revelation, as redemptive, sets before man as fully adapted to the circumstances inward and outward in which his history commences, that profound mystery of conflict between death and life in which the seed of the woman shall gain victory by bruising the serpent's head. This is the grand overture, the sublime *protevangelion*, of which we have spoken, wherein God discovers himself and his will, and challenges the attention of man, drawing him toward it by his very needs, inspiring and strengthening his hopes, ever breaking in upon his surrounding darkness, awakening his faith, stimulating his susceptibility God-ward to penetrate and hold the hallowed mystery, and poising his whole life, while apprehending it so far as possible, toward the grand consummation which it continually holds out before him as that which is to be wrought out in the sphere of his history.

Although we have in this first promise centuries of history condensed, so that the beginning and end are held together as in a vast germ; yet the process reaching from the one to the other is gradual and historical, not however in the sense that the world develops from out of itself any such issue. Rather the supernatural mystery of divine manifestation, as opening the way for its consummation in the order of our life, is historical as it continually recapitulates under itself the whole movement of history, taking up, as apprehended, a true lodgment in the

world, and becoming thus the supernatural underlying motive of every process which is positively directed toward the end which it has in view. The process is gradual just because the divine manifestation as we have said, is not magical, but comes into nature and history, conditioning itself always in relation to its possible apprehension upon the part of man. Of necessity the horizon of man's consciousness, and the sphere of his knowing are limited. He is, body, and soul and spirit, within the finite. The limit is not a *fixed* limit, however, as though at the start there could be no enlargement of capacity and no widening of the sphere of knowing. His every power has its possible process of increase. He is by his very nature in the order of history. His God-consciousness is no exception. Under the presence of the supernatural world, and in the onward progress of history it can be developed, and the divine manifestation serves continually not only to arouse it into activity, but also to give to it more and more content. But it must do this without violating the essential law of the development of moral life. If bursting in upon the world at once with its infinity of glory man would be but overwhelmed. The finite would be swallowed up. The mystery not being grasped at all would be no illumination of man's darkness, but rather a blinding of his whole capacity of vision through such magical excess of light. Hence the divine revelation has its own movement, in which the divine manifestation brings more and more of God into view, and in which the inspiration is all the while bound to this progressive unfolding as the ever widening and certain sphere of its vision.

This movement, as already intimated, must from the very nature of the case be twofold. The divine manifestation, having its source in God's purpose of love to communicate himself to the creature, reaching out to its fulness; and the inspiration resting upon the great truth that man has a capacity which is at the same time being developed, to receive within the bosom of his being such consummation. Just this is what meets us in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament. Upon the base of the first promise, the record represents a series of divine mani-

festations which as mutually interdependent follow each other, and which in promise and admonition, in covenant and law, in visions and prophecy, in institutions and record, bring nearer and nearer the fulness of God's redemptive condescension, and all this in full adaptation to the historical condition and needs of each succeeding age. At the same time and by means of this there is an inward moral process which forms the bosom in which the manifestation is continually operative, and which reaches out to the height of human susceptibility in the sphere of the finite: and this whole sublime movement is in the midst of the darkness and confusion and conflicts of a world in sin. The end of this *preparatory* unfolding of divine manifestation meets us in that ineffable mystery where the Angel of the Lord confronts the Virgin Mary, and announces to her susceptible heart the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. So also we have here the human susceptibility completed in its preparatory fitness, in the precious response of her who had found favor with God, "behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word." Here the old process ceases, and the divine manifestation, and the divine inspiration find their absolute fulness in their glorious and entire oneness in the person of the incarnate Christ. His whole life is divine manifestation in every act, and divine inspiration in every knowing, forever completed and forever one.

We have said nothing thus far of the development of heathenism, as this is outside of the sphere of special divine revelation. Yet, from what has been said, it can be seen that even here the revelation itself did not arbitrarily cast off from the benefit of its discipline a portion of the world. At first it confronted the whole race as included in Adam, and only as its mystery was on the one hand felt and acknowedged, or on the other, disregarded, was there a division in humanity. Of course, the progressive divine manifestation unfolded itself in immediate connection with its possibility of being understood; and hence there came to be in the divergent attitudes of mankind in reference to it a gradual separation into two great processes of history, one, where as apprehended the divine revela-

tion took up into itself the course of development, another, where not apprehended and acted upon, human life went on unfolding itself on the base simply of the natural, having no other data of divine manifestation than that which met its capacity Godward in the order of nature and history. These divergent processes in their incipiency meet us at the outset in Abel in contrast with Cain, in Seth, Enoch and others in whom the divine revelation authenticated itself, as over against the men of the world by whom its mystery was neither apprehended nor regarded. We find an acknowledgment of this truth in the profound statement of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Abel and Enoch and Noah are held up as acting in the sphere of faith, in the sphere of an awakened susceptibility for the divine manifestation which was challenging the world. In this way most naturally and historically did the promise develop itself into covenant in which by supernatural guidance a chosen seed came to hold within its special history the progressive unfolding of the mystery. It would have been but magical and abrupt had the divine manifestations not linked themselves together in their series where each succeeding one was made to hold itself in connection with what had gone before. How could the manifestations, if of such character come to find any proper lodgment, if passing out of their own past history, they should be made to confront the heathen world? This heathen world, however, as part of the grand process of history, cannot be said to have had no relation whatever to the reality of divine revelation. There can be recognized among the heathen continually a deeper and more wide-felt consciousness asserting itself, that the religious nature essential to man and therefore possessed by themselves, needs and must have a clearer enunciation of the idea of God and his will than in their mythologies and theosophies, to solve the terrible enigma of their sin-darkened development; and hence the consummation of the divine manifestation came to stand before them as that which they might regard as the heavenly response to their blind gropings and questionings after God.

Divine revelation in its absolute character, as we have re-

marked, is found in the person of Christ. He is divine manifestation and divine inspiration in their entire completeness and unity. He is the acme of the whole process of divine revelation; and therefore, the entire fragmentary manifestation before him had ever its objective ground in him, its controlling type and plasticity.* He confronts the world, directing all to himself, as holding in his own person the whole orb of divine light, and the exhaustless fountain of true spiritual life. To this one central sun of the whole supernatural world mankind is to look. Of this one perennial spring mankind is to drink, whose waters become in it a well springing up to everlasting life. All inspiration now must direct itself to Christ's absoluteness of manifestation, and in him the world must come to know God's whole revelation of himself to mankind. The whole pathway of history, the whole sphere of past, present and future, the whole economy of the creation from beginning to end must be viewed under this direct illumination. In the ineffable glory of the Only Begotten, the whole march of ages from the closed gates of Eden to the lifting up of the everlasting doors of Heaven, is seen unfolding its mystery of meaning. The morning glimmer of the first promise here comes widening into the golden glow of day. So to the eagle-eye of the beloved John, did the whole pre-Christian past, in the mystery of the Incarnation, reveal itself, as shown by the sublime proem of his Gospel. The Word, eternally God, and eternally with God, bringing the world into being out of the infinity of his power and life, the "pleroma of eternal ideas, of finific energies," himself the life and the light, which as coming into the world

---

*"Der objective Grund jedes Lebens aber liegt in der Idee, welche in ihm entfaltet, und äusseren Umstände und Verhältnisse nur als Mittel gebraucht, um ihren innern Reichthum zur Erscheinung zu bringen; auf die biblische Religion übergetragen, in dem göttlichen Geiste, der in stufenweise fortschreitenden Offenbarung die ihm inwohnende Fülle erschliesst, bis im gottmenschlichen Leben des Erlösers der göttliche Rathschluss zur vollendeten Verwirklichung kommt. Und da bei allem Lebendigen die Akme der Entwicklung der Typus ist, welcher den Entwicklungsgang selbst von Anfang an bestimmt und beherrscht, so ist dieser Geist der Offenbarung, das objective Princip des Alten Bundes, kein anderer als der Geist Christi. Oehler, Proleg. zur Theol. d. Alt. Test. 79, 80.)

lighteth every man, himself opening up the pathway for his full manifestation by bringing the light into the darkness (Heathenism) which struggling could neither suppress nor comprehend it, giving to his own (Judaism), to as many as received him, power to become sons of God, heralded by a long line of preparatory prophets ending in John the Baptist, but at last becoming flesh and dwelling among men, so that they beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

As thus all antecedent preparatory revelation was but the opening of the way by the Word for his incarnation, a sublime process sweeping over ages, so we have again in this absolute revelation a progress in which the life of Christ as continuous divine manifestation unfolds itself before men, and challenges their susceptibility for the supernatural at every step. In him at every point the inspiration is wholly commensurate with the manifestation. The two are inseparable as they interpenetrate each other in his person. But in his disciples and apostles there is nothing of this absolute character. They see in part and know in part. They are confronted with the mystery, and only gradually rise to an apprehension of it, and this in immediate connection with the whole economy of revelation which had gone before in the Old Testament and in the witnessing of John the Baptist. In their awakened susceptibility they are at first drawn toward him and timidly inquire. "Rabbi, where dwellest thou." Met with the answer "come and see," they tarry with him, and then we next see them hurrying to their most intimate associates with something more than *Rabbi* in their consciousness. We have found the Messias is their language, showing that the revelation of the Old Testament was now beginning to take definite shape in their thought, arousing into more intense activity their efforts to apprehend its meaning in the fulfillment which was now confronting them. So continually as their susceptibility is awakened, Christ directs them to himself as the fulness of life and light, and they in his presence, and by his words and works, are drawn more and more into the bosom of his revelation; but only as the whole manifestation,

which was to be the content to which their inspiration should direct itself, became complete when Jesus conquering death and hell rose and ascended to the right hand of the Father, was the way opened for that full inward illumination, which in the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles brought home to their prepared consciousness the mystery of Christ's presence and words and acts, so that the divine manifestation which they had witnessed in his whole life now came out with its fulness and certainty of revelation. Their own commission, the holy mysteries connected with it, the whole order in fine of the New Testament Church as this had evolved itself from Christ's person and work, now stood with unmistakable clearness before them, and they were ready to enter upon that labor of their office, (itself the fruit of the ascension), in which the manifestation which had confronted them and had lodged itself in the bosom of our life and history through the Holy Ghost was to hold itself before the vision of mankind, challenging their obedience and accomplishing its regenerating and sanctifying work until it should reach out historically in the end to what was lodged in it from the beginning, viz., to the second advent and the new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

From the very fact that their inspiration was directed continually to the mystery of Christ, which had challenged them as it passed before them and which had drawn them to itself and connected them with the whole constitution of divine grace which it brought into the world, did they at once herald the glorious Gospel, and baptize in Christ's name, challenging obedience to just the positive contents which his person and work had brought into the vision of their faith (creed); and when in this work they were impelled to give a historical record, that record commences of necessity with the life of Christ, and closes with the prophetic unfolding of the content of that life through the spirit in the struggles of the church as moving through the crisis of ages it at last opens before the awed vision of the Seer the last judgment, and kindles the admiring rapture of his love with the New Jerusalem prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

ART. IV.—DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.*

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

This interesting and important volume makes its appearance as one of a series of works devoted to the History of the Sciences generally in Modern Germany; a noble undertaking, which is carried forward it appears, by the special patronage of the King of Bavaria, and under the auspices of a commission acting in behalf of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Munich. Upwards of twenty different works are embraced in the plan; several of which have been already completed, while the rest are in active preparation; all from eminent scholars, supposed to be properly fitted for their task. There is a History of modern Catholic Theology in the series, a History of Philosophy, a History of Aesthetics, a History of Classical Philology, a History of Geology, a History of Medicine, and so on through the catalogue of the more important Sciences generally. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology forms the fifth volume of the course.

It is not necessary to say, that it is a work of the first merit in its own order. How could it be otherwise, coming from such a theologian as Dorner, and occupied with so fruitful a theme as the movement of Protestant Theology from the age of Luther down to the present time?

The very idea of a *History* of Protestant Theology, as we have it here brought into view, is eminently suggestive and full of instruction. It implies at once, the author tells us, the con-

* Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland, nach ihrer principiellen Bewegung und im Zusammenhang mit dem religiösen, sittlichen und intellectuellen Leben betrachtet von DR. J. A. DORNER. Auf Veranlassung und mit Unterstützung Seiner Majestät des Königs von Bayern, Maximilian II. Herausgegeben durch die historische Commission bei der Königl. Academie der Wissenschaften. München, 1867.

ception of an organized unity and wholeness in this theology, in distinction from all merely outward aggregation of opinions; since in no other view could it be said to have any living history whatever. To be historical, moreover, it must be more than it is taken to be where it is regarded as a protest simply against previously existing errors, the negation and contradiction of the theology of the Roman Catholic Church; it must have a positive substance and independent existence of its own, aside from all that may belong to it as accidental only in its relations to other systems. It must enter in this view integrally into the general constitution of Christianity, and show itself to be a necessary part of its proper universal life. Only so can it have a right to exist, or be a subject at all for scientific study.

Thus positive and historical in its own nature, Protestantism must be also the product and outbirth of what Christianity was before it made its appearance. It is impossible to conceive of it as being historical at all, except as Christianity at large is seen and acknowledged to be historical. There is a view of Protestanism, we know, which owns no necessity for this; which sees in it rather wrong and disparagement to the whole cause of religion in the Protestant form. Its assumption is, that what is called the history of the Church in previous centuries was no history of Christianity at all, in any proper sense of the term; that Christianity for ages before had not been historical, but existed only in the Bible, or as the dim memory of a long buried past; that the history of the Church had become the movement and record only of a vast system of corruptions, which had well nigh extinguished at last the light and power of the Gospel altogether. How could Protestantism be supposed to derive its existence in any positive way from so foul a womb? How could its sweet waters flow from a fountain so full of impurity and bitterness? To be of God, in these circumstances, it must be a new religion entirely, drawn fresh from the Bible, having no connection with the life of the Catholic Church as it stood before, except in the way of protest and denial, and related to what Christianity may be imagined to have been in the beginning, only as its abrupt reproduction and restoration with-

out any regard to intervening time. This view of the origin and meaning of Protestantism was once common, and there are certain quarters in which it is entertained still. But it is too late in the day, to allow it now any sort of consideration. For science and religion alike, it may be considered as fairly and forever exploded. They are bad Protestants, everywhere and always, who insist on making Protestantism unhistorical. The life of the world universally is historical, a moving stream of united, continuous existence. It is so especially in Christianity, which is the central current of this stream. And if Protestantism be in fact, as it claims to be, the inmost and deepest sense of Christianity, then is it plain, not only that it must have a history of its own from the time of its appearance in the sixteenth century, but also that this history must so issue forth from the general historical flow of what Christianity was all along before, as to be plainly its continuation, and at the same time the deepest power of it, reaching onward now in such new form to its ultimate destination. Only in such view can it deserve confidence, or be entitled to any rational consideration and respect.

According to Dr. Dorner, this historical relation of Protestantism to Catholicism does not necessarily imply even a full antiquation of the second in favor of the first, authorizing us to say that the older form of Christianity, having served its purpose, has lost its right to exist in giving birth to the new; as Judaism, for example, was abolished by the accomplishment of its own promises through the Gospel. Protestantism, he tells us, may be allowed to be a higher plane of the Christian life than was reached before either by the Greek or Roman Churches — a plane, therefore, to whose level in the end all Christendom must be raised; while yet it may be true, nevertheless, that Protestantism is only itself, for the time, a partial and more or less defective representation of what belongs properly to this loftier stage of Christian history, needing to be complemented by still other forms of evangelical life; which it may not be able then, itself to produce, but must be content to accept in the end from the bosom of the older systems which it

seemed to have left behind. In other words, it is by no means certain that Protestantism, in breaking forth from the womb of the Catholic Church, carried away with it *all* the significance of that Church for the final purposes of Christianity. It could hardly fail, in the circumstances, to be more than the strongly intoned utterance of some one necessary and fundamental view of Christianity, which was felt to be in danger of being overwhelmed by the force which was carrying the Church at large in the opposite direction. Such affirmation became necessarily thus negation, and taking upon itself in this way the form of a standing *protest* against the errors of the Roman Church, made it extremely difficult for the movement to escape afterwards a one-sided character in its own direction, or to admit any free development even of its own life, where this seemed to involve a recognition again of principles and peculiarities belonging to the old religion. Under such view, it is easy to see, that there may be still essential elements of the full and last sense of Christianity, which Protestantism has not yet taken up into its separate life, peculiarities needed to complete the full idea of the Church still slumbering as possibilities in the bosom of the Greek and Roman Communions, which only the elevation of these Communions themselves to the general plane of Protestantism can serve to make the common property of the Christian world in the end. This need not imply then, of course, the breaking up of the old religions in favor of the new. Advanced to the same evangelical stage, all will stand together in free harmony and love, as integral components of one and the same Holy Catholic Christianity.

"Protestantism," says Dr. Dorner, "seeks its ultimate ground in the essence of Christianity, as we have this exhibited to us originally in the Holy Scriptures. But it may not, for all this, decline the task of vindicating its separate existence and peculiar constitution *historically;* that is, the task of showing under a historical view, that there was need for it when it came both negatively and positively, that it came in the fulness of time, and that it is still an indispensable necessity for the Christian world."

The History of Protestant Theology, under the broad view now stated, is divided by Dorner into three books; the first treating of the Origin or Primitive Period of Protestantism; the second, of the Separation of its two Confessions and the Dissolution of the Unity of its original twofold Principle, from the first part of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century; the third, of the Regeneration of Evangelical Theology, as it is supposed to be going forward in our own time. What an interesting field is here offered to the contemplation of the thoughtful student, must be at once evident to all who are in any way prepared to understand the nature of the general subject, or who can at all appreciate the bearings of this subject on the cause of Christianity as a whole.

The First Book (*Die Urzeit des Protestantismus*) opens with a sketch, brief of course, but comprehensive and clear, of the causes and forces which served to prepare the way for Protestantism, ages before its actual advent, in the life of the Catholic Church as it existed previously. These are found to be of a twofold character, negative and positive.

The *negative* side of the preparation lies, of course, in the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, which gradually took a form that forced upon it the reactionary crisis of the Reformation, as the only way in which the general cause of Christianity could be rescued from destruction. The Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, we are told by Dorner, had accomplished vast service for the world in its time. Our modern life is under infinite obligations to it, for what it wrought in these times of darkness and wild, untamed rudeness, in favor of social order, political discipline, letters, morals, religion, and human culture generally. It was a great advance in these respects on the one-sided intellectualism of the Oriental or Greek Church. It was set for the pedagogy of the new Western nations. But this of itself served to give it a constitution and tendency, which became in the end an unnatural restraint upon the proper independence of the nations. Outward order and rule were made to stand in the way of inward intelligence and freedom. Thus the Church came to be considered

all in all for the purposes of salvation, in the character of a mere outward hierarchical organization, absorbing into itself all kingly, priestly, and prophetical functions; while the people at large were given over to serve mechanical forms, which became for them, in fact, no better than dumb idols, and left them without any sense whatever of their proper inheritance in the free, boundless wealth of the Gospel. Altogether, in this way, the Papacy grew to be an intolerable tyranny for the souls and minds of men, as well as for their outward lives.

The general ground defect of the Mediæval Church life, according to Dorner, lay in its dualistic nature and character. Not of course in the recognition simply of two modes of being, two factoral forces required to meet everywhere in Christianity, the Divine and the human, the objective and the subjective, the general and the individual, the principle of authority and the principle of freedom; but in the want of power there was to bring these different forms of existence to any real inward unity and harmony; in consequence of which, the relation between them was always more or less oppositional, mechanical, and unfree. Such abstract dualism we have in the general theory of the Church which has just been noticed; all rule and power on one side, and on the other only passive, irresponsible dependence and obedience. So in the sphere of doctrine again, we meet it in the conflict between faith and knowledge, reaching through the whole time of the schoolmen, and ending at last in the formal reduction of faith to the character of a mere blind submission to the outward authority of the Church. The result of this was in the end a general demoralization of the intellectual consciousness of the Christian world, wide-spread skepticism and doubt, and a perilous exposure of spirit on all sides to the worst forms of irreligious error. The theological scheme itself which was thus outwardly imposed upon the Church, partook of the same dualistic character. It was a mixture of Pelagianism and magic, oscillating at different points always between superstition and unbelief. With this corresponded the moral and religious life of the time. It swung between extremes. Rigorous in one direction, it was

completely lax in another. It came to no harmony, no inward reconciliation, within itself. Altogether, the religious impotence and misery of the nominally Christian world had grown to be very great; and all must acknowledge that the necessity and demand for the Reformation, which existed in this crying form, go far of themselves to establish the full historical significance of Protestantism.

Along with this want and need, however, went also the working of active forces in the life of the Church itself, all through the Middle Ages, which carried in them the promise of better things to come, and prepared the way powerfully for what took place at last in the sixteenth century. This *positive* preparation for Protestantism must be taken into account as a necessary argument of its truth. All was not dark before its advent. Its historical legitimacy requires us to see in it, not only an answer to the crying necessities of the time going before, but the fulfilment also of its best powers and endeavors. To be true, Protestantism must be the rich, ripe fruit of Mediæval Catholicism, the natural product of its inmost religious spirit, the solution of its deepest problems, the interpretation of the vast riddle that lay involved everywhere in its struggling life. "Only thus," says Dr. Dorner, with great force, "do we possess ourselves of all that was truly great in the Middle Ages, and become able to apprehend the Evangelical Church in her organic connection with the Ancient Church, and so with the Apostolic Period itself; whereas, had she been a new Church, with no intervening life found joining her to this primitive Christianity, she must at once by such unhistorical position alone have raised the suspicion that she was the work mainly of human self-will, and that as she had come abruptly like a sudden meteor—a frightful portent for the Roman Church, it is true—so probably she would suddenly again disappear, without the inward and enduring power of correction that might turn the portent into an occasion of thankful joy for the Roman Church herself (Heb. xii. 7–12). If the Church of the Reformation was to deserve the title *Evangelical*, to which she lays claim, the pure stream of the Gospel, which since the time

of Christ could never have wholly failed among men, must have found in her a new bed; not to draw off thence onward all that was evangelical in the Catholic Church, but to secure it *for* her also as against her own corruption."

The positive forces, which worked thus historically toward the Reformation in the life of the Middle Ages, are supposed by Dorner to fall mainly under the threefold classification of *Mysticism*, *Biblical Study*, and *Popular Culture*. These factors, however, come not forward simultaneously, nor at once in full harmony. They are a growing movement in themselves; and only by their joint result, at the last, give us the reformatory principle in its true Church-renovating form and force.

The movement starts, of course, in the *Mystic Element*, as lying nearest the heart-life of all religion. Here we find, all through the Mediæval Period, a profound struggle in the depths of the religious spirit, the object of which was to reach direct and full communion with God, and which became in this way a continual conflict with the dualistic conditions of the Church system in which it was outwardly comprehended. It took different forms, first predominantly intellectual, then more ethical, culminating finally in the German mysticism, whose best fruit meets us in such writers as Tauler and Thomas a Kempis. There was great merit and vast meaning in the system; but it was at the same time seriously defective, and needed censure and rectification from a different quarter.

This it was brought to meet, in a measure, from the *Biblical Factor*, the second general preparatory force leading toward the Reformation. The study of the Bible stood in no connection at first with Mysticism, but followed for a time its own course separately, in the service of the plainest and most practical Christianity, as among the Waldenses. Gradually it attained to more theological insight and depth, as with Wickliffe, Huss, and their followers. With the progress of time, the Biblical and Mystical tendencies came more or less into contact with one another; and the result was a benefit on both sides, the flowing together of forces that by their union alone became properly strong for the end they were designed to reach.

"The Biblical tendency, especially in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, spreading itself from Southern France and Piedmont, through Switzerland, along the Rhine, into the Netherlands and England, and eastwardly into Bohemia, Poland and Moravia, contributed mightily to establish as a fixed axiom throughout Christendom the principle, that the Church must be content to be measured and tried by the Holy Scriptures. It gave impulse also to the numerous translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongues, which fall within the same period. Leading representatives of this tendency, as well as the fruit of it, are to be considered in particular those popular and useful fraternities of the Netherlands, the *Brethren of the Common Life*, which were founded by Gerhard Groot in 1384, and improved subsequently by Florentius Radewins; and which, living together with community of goods, but without the constraint of vows, in spiritual though not monkish society, devoted themselves to mutual edification, especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures; following their trades diligently however at the same time, while they made it their business also to diffuse instruction among the people. They disseminated scriptural religious knowledge even among the higher classes, encouraged science, and showed favor also toward the interest of mysticism. With all this, they kept themselves free from all hostile bearing toward the Church; the old fanatical Beghard and Beguin houses reappearing in them thus, under higher and better form. Nowhere else before the Reformation, do we find the elements of reformatory power brought together in such compass as here."

To complete the working of the mystical and biblical factors, we have, in the third place, the general gradual progress of European *Culture*, which wrought in various ways towards the emancipation of the popular mind from the bonds of ignorance and error, and carried it forward in the direction required for the coming reformation of Christianity and the Church. The revival of letters, indeed, seemed for a time in certain quarters to be more favorable to infidelity than to the cause of true religion; and the movement itself, in this way, needed historical

enlargement and rectification. In the end, however, it fell in harmoniously with the other forces, imparting to them new depth and compass of meaning, and receiving from them in return wholesome regulation in its own course.

After showing in the general way now stated, how the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century grew forth historically from the previous life of the Church, Dr. Dorner goes on to consider, in the second place, the immediate rise of the Reformation itself, in what he calls the unity of its original principle and growth, reaching from a. 1517 to a. 1525. This falls into two divisions or sections; the first treating of the Lutheran Reformation, the second of its counterpart in Switzerland.

To understand the Lutheran Reformation, it is necessary, first of all, to understand Luther himself. As the great genius of the movement, he was, in one sense, the product and birth of the general historical force which was comprehended in it. So it is, we are often told, with all grand movements in the history of humanity. They create, in a certain sense, their own organs, the representative men by whose agency they are brought to pass. But the individual significance of such men, their personal weight as independent forces in what has taken place, is none the less to be acknowledged for this reason. So Luther stands before us as himself the germ and pattern of the new order of life he served to introduce into the Christian world. We see in him "one of those vast historical figures, in which whole nations recognize their own types, their concentrated selves; in which the soul of a new moral and religious existence takes bodily form." How deeply his spirit entered, in this way, into the German mind in particular, is shown strikingly by the tenacity with which the Lutheran Church has all along clung to his name as her distinctive confessional title. It is the misfortune of Protestantism, we cannot help thinking, that this should have been the case. Luther himself, in the spirit of St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, protested against any such quasi-deification of his person; and many of the best Lutherans have deplored it since. But the name has attached itself, for all this, as an indelible signature to the en-

tire Church, down to the present time; and there is no reason now to suppose that either the Church or its theology can ever be known by any other title than Lutheran, as distinguished from Roman Catholicism on one side, and from the Reformed faith on the other. It is only too evident, moreover, that the name itself goes farther here as a bond of union than any doctrine or Church life it is made to represent; since it is notorious that the so called Lutheran Church has embraced, and still continues to embrace, in its voluminous and capacious bosom, many forms of theological and ecclesiastical life, widely variant from one another, as well as in part, also, broadly opposed to all that Luther ever held or taught himself. The power which holds all together through changing generations and over widely sundered lands, is simply the uplifted standard of his vast and mighty name (*in hoc signo!*), enthroned forever, as it would seem, in the depths of the German heart. What clearer argument could we have of the historical and national significance of his person? We have nothing which fully comes up to it, in this view, anywhere else, either in the history of the Church or in the history of the world.

Luther himself, of course, had no conception of his own character or work, in becoming thus the organ of the German Reformation. There was no forethought or plan in what he did. It is not in that way, ever, that truly representative men fulfil their mission. They are always borne forward more or less unconsciously and passively, by the power of what they are, in another view, actively bringing to pass. In the case of Luther, this unpremeditated character of the relation in which he stood to his work comes everywhere into view. We feel the full force of it particularly, when we observe to what an extent it lay, not in his individual nature simply, not in what he was merely as a man, but in what he became himself, first of all, through the power of the Gospel, in the new Christian personality through which he was enabled to save himself from the wreck and chaos of his old life, before thinking of anything beyond himself. The whole sense of the Reformation lay in his own experience. He had lived himself, with mighty

birth-struggle, into its inmost principle, and felt the presence of it as a new creation in his soul, before he became unwittingly the organ of God's Spirit for proclaiming it, and heralding it to the world at large. "He did not set himself up to be a saint," says Dorner, "but he became of model, world-historical significance for the German mind, and far beyond, by being a man who had wrestled to find inward peace and direct communion with God—life-questions for the souls of all truly earnest and thoughtful men—and had not wrestled in vain. Having thus gone through conflict and victory in his own spirit, he committed his experiences, with eloquent faith, to the heart of his people, and so won among them the place of a competent and trustworthy leader in things pertaining to eternal salvation. True, he is a hero of the German *national* spirit, whose image even yet is of magical force for all circles, high or low; but not by his natural individuality as such, nor yet by his word as doctrine merely, has he made himself so enduringly felt; the secret of his power lies in all that served to form him to the type of an Apostolic disciple, and to an example, we will not say of the Christian life generally, but of conscious personal Christianity advanced to the ripeness of manhood—above all, in his clear, free apprehension of the way of salvation through Christ. His faith it was, emphatically, that gave him strength; and through this it became his life-work outwardly also, to open again to the free knowledge of every one the glory and power of the Gospel, and to lead even the simplest Christian to an experience of redemption, as direct and original as that by which he had himself been raised from death to life and from hell to heaven."

Dorner's history of Protestant Theology carries us back thus very properly to what may be considered the cradle of this new form of religion, as we have it offered to our view in the spiritual experience of Luther. To some it may seem not altogether satisfactory to find the movement referred in this way to so small and poor a beginning. They would be better pleased if it could be shown to have come with more outward observation and more general concert, more comprehensive consideration

and plan. But viewing Protestantism as a new creation, a reorganization in full of Christian life and doctrine, it is not easy to see how it could have deserved confidence in any other form so well as in that which here marks its origin in fact. No political authority, of course, could have inaugurated so vast a revolution (as in England) with the same title to respect; but neither would it have had so much the character and presumption of being a divine work, if it had been effected by an ecclesiastical council or a theological school. One of the most powerful arguments for the truth and right of the Lutheran Reformation, after all, will be found to lie in its origin, as the power of a new life in the man Luther himself, before it became a new form of doctrine either for himself or for the world at large. To be at all such a new creation as it has claimed to be, it *must* start in this way; it must be life first, like Christianity in the beginning, in order to become doctrine afterwards. Under no other view, we may add, does the character of Protestantism vindicate itself so clearly as being positive and not merely negative, the actual embracing of truth, and not a perpetual protest simply against supposed error. However it may have been with many calling themselves Protestants in later times, it is certain that with Luther himself, the father and fountain-head of German Protestantism in the sixteenth century, the interest of affirming the true sense of Christianity went before the interest of denying what was felt afterwards to contradict this sense. Religion for him was the most intense form of personal life; faith, the most positive apprehension of objective divine realities; without any thought at all, at first, of contradicting the authority of the reigning Church. The contradiction came at last only through the irrepressible force of what faith found itself constrained to confess and affirm. The positive can easily be seen to rule and determine the negative throughout. Confession first; then protest. Such is the honorable and only just sense of Protestantism, as it mirrors itself to our contemplation in the great soul of Martin Luther; and under no other view, certainly, can it so well lay claim to

historical justification, as being truly the work of God, and not simply the device and contrivance of men.

In the history before us we have first, then, a graphic sketch of the personal development of Luther as far as to the year 1517. In the next place it is shown how the faith that was in him became a principle of censure and reformation over against the abuses with which he found himself surrounded in the Church; how it brought him, without will or forethought of his own, more and more deeply and widely into conflict with the existing order of things; and how, at last, having passed in this way through successive stages of controversy and debate, it forced him finally to a full and complete rupture with the Papacy and all its powers. By this time the cause he represented had itself become a power, moving with irresistible force in its own direction. It had come to a happy union with learning and science through the university of Wittenberg, and a host of strength was added to it in the person of Melancthon. The principle of reform made itself felt as a witness against the errors of Rome on all sides. It was not enough, however, that it should assert itself simply in this way. As the power of a new positive creation, it must be able to limit and bound itself also on the opposite side, by withstanding successfully all forms of thought, which might seek to make common cause with it as against Rome, while yet they ran in fact toward the destruction of the true Gospel altogether. It was a vast peril to which the Reformation was exposed. in this way, from excesses and caricatures, that put themselves forward everywhere in its name, and claimed to be the only true and full expression of its sense; and nothing served more in the end to prove the substantive character of the movement, and to give assurance of its enduring success, than the way in which it refused to ally itself to these false tendencies, and held itself steadily to its own path. Here come into view Luther's controversies with such men as Carlstadt, with the Anabaptists, with false mysticism and radical subjectivism in all forms, with the Antinomians, with dreamers like Schwenckfeld on the one hand, and with moderatists like Erasmus on the other.

Through all these controversies, the principle of the Reformation, as it reigned in the mind of Luther, wrought as an organic force, gathering to itself what was congenial to its own nature and throwing off what was foreign and incongruous, strengthening itself continually by exercise and taking volume and form more and more, so as to bring out at last in full measure the actual presence and full grown proportions of a renovated Evangelical German Church. The reality and vital energy of the principle are powerfully demonstrated, by the power it had to maintain itself in this way. For Luther was no philosopher or scholastic theologian. His divinity was more intuitional always than logical. The Gospel was not with him, therefore, a given finished system of intellectual propositions, that might be applied mechanically to all occasions as they rose. It was the sense of a new life only, full of the most positive substance, which must work its way through all confusion and chaos to intelligible form. That it did so, without involving him in self-contradiction, without losing itself in vague uncertainty and doubt, so as to furnish consistent matter as it did for the vast structures of theology that come before us in the later scholastic period of the Lutheran Church, is something at which we may well marvel, and which rightly considered can hardly fail to inspire us with true reverence for the Reformation, as having been in very deed what may deserve to be called a new creation in the history of the Christian world.

And what now *was* the principle of this creation, the power that wrought organifically to bring it to pass and to give it form? We may say in general, it was the union of faith with the word of God. The principle is thus of a compound character. It has two sides, which are frequently spoken of as being in fact two different principles; one underlying the matter of the Christian salvation, and the other determining its form. Where this distinction is made, the material principle is *justification by faith alone in Christ*, the formal principle is the *exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures*. Luther allowed to both of these principles independent worth

and right, but so as to see clearly and turn to fruitful account, at the same time, their indissoluble connection. It is a most interesting inquiry, to ascertain how they were thus distinguished and yet brought together as a single power in his mind. No inquiry can be more important, either for the right understanding of the great Reformer himself, or for the right understanding of the Reformation. It may be considered indeed the necessary key, in some sense, for understanding rightly the universal history of Protestantism.

Justification by faith, that article of a standing or falling Church, was something very different with Luther from what it has been taken to be, by many who have made it their watch-word since his time. As the corner-stone of Christianity, it was for him, of course, vastly more than any doctrine simply bearing this title. The great truth, as he held it, was in the fullest sense spirit and life. In such form, it was anything but a subjective sentiment simply in the mind of the believer. How far this view has been allowed to run away with the doctrine, making it the vehicle of damnable falsehood, all may easily see and know. In one direction, we find it in the character of an abstract intellectual solifidianism, producing the most wretched carnal security and antinomian indifference to all good works. In another direction, it meets us in the shape of wild, fanatical sectarianism, scorning the outward word and sacraments, and resolving all religion into private inspiration and fancy—the very fiend of unsacramental *Schwärmerei*, with which Luther had to do battle, long and heavy, in defence of his own doctrine and cause. Then again it looks forth upon us, with a sort of cold Mephistopheles grin, from the camp of Liberal and Rationalistic Christianity, where it is made to be another word only for the rejection of all positive Christianity, and a general trust in God without any reference to Christ whatever. Thus it is, that errors from all points of the compass come together on this common confession of justification by faith; all claiming to be Protestant in the fullest and best sense of the term; and all arrogating to themselves

the title *evangelical*, as having in their own opinion exhausted the inmost marrow of the Gospel.

Alas for the article of a standing or falling Church, in such an evangelical Babel as this. Luther's principle was never intended certainly to take in forms of Christianity like these. On the contrary, it was intended to shut them out as unevangelical and false. With him, faith was far more than an opinion, judgment, sentiment, or merely subjective state of any kind. It was such an inward relation of its subject (the believer) to its proper object (Christ and his work—the Gospel in its true sense), as involved at once the real apprehension of the object in its own proper living form. Faith found its own necessary complement thus in that which it was brought to embrace; and what it embraced was no doctrine simply or outward word, but the actual living substance of the Gospel itself.

Regarded as the beginning of the Christian life, this faith must start, in the nature of the case, where the grace of redemption first reaches over into the consciousness of the sinner —must be an appropriation of God's mercy exhibited in the forgiveness of sin. It is thus justifying faith; because it sets its subject in felt, assured communication with the only ground of justification, the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. In the apprehension of this sacrifice, however, it is not simply the doctrine of the atonement that is embraced; it is the living fact of the atonement itself, as being of perennial force to take away sin; and as this cannot for a moment be sundered from the person of the Saviour, it follows, that it is always Christ himself, who is thus embraced, under the view particularly of his priestly work, as the great object by which faith becomes efficacious here for the deliverance of the soul from the condemning and disabling power of sin.

Such faith is what it is, only by coming into real union with its object, and so causing its object to come into real union with its subject. It is at once in this way both of subjective and objective force. It assures the believer of his interest in Christ, and at the same time authenticates to him the truth of Christ

and the reality of the Gospel, as they can be authenticated to him without this by no argument or proof besides.

In this view, faith is with Luther an independent principle of evangelical truth, and not a secondary authority simply depending on the Bible. It is the direct apprehension of the truth itself, the seeing eye in actual vision, the immediate meeting of the soul with its proper life in Christ, which requires and allows no intervening mediation or condition. In such view, it cannot be said to rest on the authority of the written word, the assurance of any outward inspiration. It is *sui juris* in its own sphere, having to do only with the positive substance of the Gospel itself, back of all certification of what it is in any other way. It was not the authority of the Bible, that first brought Luther himself to the exercise of faith and the sense of justification. It was, he tells us, by having his attention turned to the article of the forgiveness of sins in the Apostles' Creed, that he came to lay hold of Christ in his own person, and was thus made to emerge from darkness into the marvellous light of the Gospel. His Christianity, like that of the first Christians, took root at once in the self-authenticating presence of the Christian salvation itself.

Luther's "justifying faith," let it be well considered then, was no apprehension simply of the merit of Christ in an abstract, impersonal view; it was the laying hold of the atonement in Christ, the atonement under a living, personal form. It embraced the whole Christ, and took in all his benefits potentially, no less than the forgiveness of sins. "Hence Luther," according to Dorner, "holds throughout (with the best later Lutheran theologians), that justifying faith, that is, the faith which appropriates justification, includes also love, and so in principle and germ at least the presence of good works. The believer remains not what he was before; not only is there a change of relation between him and God through the imputed merit of Christ, but his faith has brought into him also a new life. Faith is a new tree of life, which cannot but put forth the fruits of love and wisdom." Throughout, indeed, it is only the laying hold of the fact of God's mercy in Christ that justi-

fies us, and puts us in the way of becoming holy; but still our justification is the root of our sanctification. It is more than a simply forensic act, an outward thought on the part of God. What God thinks and speaks in the case, is necessarily of creative force for the soul into which his thought comes, and cannot fail to work productively there, as the power of a new consciousness and the principle of a regenerated life.

The position which Luther assigns to faith, as the material principle of Christianity over against the Bible, is wonderfully independent and free. He will know of no mechanical subjugation of the spirit here to a rule holding entirely beyond itself. Faith alone furnishes the key for the proper interpretation of the Bible. Faith must unfold and apply the sense of the Bible. Faith may sit in judgment even on the canon and text of the Bible. How far he carried this liberty of criticism himself, is well known. The Epistle of James he rejected altogether; and he was but little more indulgent towards the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. He goes so far even as to say of an argument of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, that it will not hold good; and he has no trouble in admitting, that not only St. Stephen, but the sacred writers themselves, are chargeable with inaccuracies. His views of the Old Testament are liberal in the extreme. The canon of the Scriptures is everywhere for him a still more or less open question. Some books are of higher worth than others. There are different degrees of inspiration. He distinguishes everywhere plainly, between the Divine word (the actual substance of revelation) and the written record we have of it in the Bible; and his whole view of inspiration implies that it is to be considered as of a historical, living character throughout, involving the human in the divine, under the most different modes and forms, and all in the freest possible way.

But with all this stress laid on the material principle, Luther is no less strong again in asserting the independence also of the formal principle of the Reformation, the exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures over against every other rule of doctrine or life. So in his polemics with the Roman Church,

and so also in his polemics with the subjective fanaticism of the Anabaptists. Christ works continuously in the world through the outward word and sacraments; and he will hear of no Christianity that proceeds not from his presence among men in this form. The Holy Scriptures are the only infallible source for knowing what Christianity was in the beginning, the only sure measure and norm for determining what it is now. What faith certifies for truth must be tried continually by this rule.

Here seems to be a dilemma. How can these two principles each asserting its own independence, stand together in one and the same system? Luther enters into no formal conciliation of the difficulty. But it is practically solved for him by his sound Christian experience itself; and both principles flow together in his consciousness, as only different sides in fact of one and the same principle. Faith and the outward Word look to the same object and find their proper completeness in the same end. In their legitimate course then, they cannot come into real conflict. The guaranty of their full inward correspondence lies in their being true to themselves, and in their following, independently, each the law of its own nature. The Word demands faith as the necessary organ for its right apprehension; while faith seeks the Word as that which offers to it its own proper food and ministers continually to its growth and strength. Thus are they in mutual relation throughout, the material and formal sides simply of the same generating power, the principle which must be considered the root of all true Protestantism.

After the rise of Lutheranism, we have next, in Dorner's *Urzeit des Protestantismus*, a general survey of the origin of the Reformed Confession, as it rose in Switzerland simultaneously with the German movement. Full justice is done to its distinctive and independent character. It begins in a certain sense with Ulrich Zwingli; but he bears no such relation to it as that of Luther to the Reformation in Germany. His person is not for it at all of any like central and fundamental significance. He cannot be regarded as its original type. He is simply one among a number of others, who appear as leaders in a diffusive popular revolution, without owing to him particu-

larly their governing thought and spirit. There may have been some disadvantage in this; but it is easy to see in it also much advantage. It saved the Reformed Confession from the proprietorship of a human name. We feel at once how it must have been belittled and wronged, by becoming known as the *Zwinglian Church.* There was no possibility of that, even among the cantons of its native Switzerland; much less, as its lines went forth afterwards over Western Europe, through France and along the Rhine, to Holland, England, Scotland, and finally also far and wide over the Northern half of the New World. Over against this development, the person and name of Zwingli, with all that was generous in his nature or noble and heroic in his life, shrink deservedly into historical insignificance. In no sense can he be regarded as either the fountain or the foundation of the Reformed Church.

We have in the rise of the Reformed Church two stages; the first a sort of unripe preparation merely for the second, in which we reach at last its full confessional sense. It is only for the incipient stage that Zwingli can be said to have even relatively the character of a leader; and even here there was nothing strictly creative, as with Luther, in the working of his spirit. It had no power, except in part at Zurich, to impress itself permanently on the symbolical theology of the Church. The Swiss Confessions represent a later life.

There is a generic difference, of course, between the Lutheran and Reformed types of Protestantism. We will not pretend here to sketch it even in outline. It is not easy, indeed, to bring it to clear intellectual delineation; as is shown by the fact, that the best attempts which have been made to set the subject in proper light, besides conflicting with one another, are found in no case entirely satisfactory. But the difference itself admits of no question. It is of a kind to be felt, even where it cannot be fully understood or explained. The Reformers, on both sides, all felt it in the beginning; and it has perpetuated itself in the spirit of the two Confessions, through all changes they have suffered since, down to the present time. Yet has this felt difference never been of such sort,

at the same time, as to destroy absolutely the sense of a common life. Neither form of faith has been able to hold itself entirely independent of the other. There has been between them a mutual attraction, no less than a mutual repulsion. The full idea of Protestantism has been felt to require and embrace them both.

The Swiss movement thus, in the beginning, was regarded as kindred in full with the German. The difference between them came not at once into view. Their unity stood not only in their common opposition to Rome, but in their essential agreement besides with regard to the supreme authority of the Scriptures, and the freeness of God's grace in Christ; and then again in their common conservatism also over against false spiritualistic tendencies in the hyper-protestant direction. For the Swiss too had to defend their cause on this side in opposition to the religious anarchy both of the Anabaptists and of the Antitrinitarians. Still the constitutional difference of the Confessions was at hand also from the first; and it was not long before it began to make itself painfully felt. The occasion, as is well known, was the question of our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist.

According to Dr. Dorner, Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper was not at first so different from that of Luther as to be a matter of particular observation; being substantially indeed, the same view that was received generally afterwards, through the influence of Calvin, into the Reformed Confessions, with which Luther himself, as we know, had no disposition to quarrel. He was led, however, through certain influences, gradually to shift his ground, and in the year 1524 proclaimed, in his celebrated letter to Matthew Alber, what was felt to be on all sides a doctrine at full variance with the Lutheran. This became the signal for sharp controversy, leading to much bitterness and provocation, and tending of course toward extreme positions on both sides. That Zwingli's sacramental doctrine now had become poor and low, and much of one sort with the rationalistic theory that prevails among so called evangelical sects of modern times generally, admits of no question, and is

practically proved by the fact of its subsequent repudiation on the part of the Swiss Churches themselves. Calvin, we know, went so far as to pronounce it profane. Even Zwingli himself seems to have returned again, before he died, to better thoughts on the subject, by which room was made for the Marburg Conference in 1529; the beginning of a peace between the contending parties, which reached its consummation, after his death, in the memorable Wittenberg Concord of 1536. This carries us over what may be called the first comparatively unripe stage of development in the Primitive History of the Reformed Church.

Having come thus far, the work before us advances to a third main division of its First Book, devoted to the object of representing the movement of the doctrinal life of both Confessions on to its symbolical conclusion, as this is reached for the Lutheran Church in 1580 by the Form of Concord, and for the Reformed Church in 1620 by the Articles of the Synod of Dort.

The first section of this division gives us a comprehensive view of the vast internal conflicts, through which the Lutheran doctrine was brought to complete itself in this way for the Lutheran consciousness, in what was supposed to be its necessary ultimate form. Dorner sees in these violent theological struggles, of course, a steady historical movement toward a determinate general end. They reduce themselves for him to six main controversies, falling into three counterpart pairs: first, the *Antinomian* and the *Majoristic*; then, the *Osiandrian* and the *Stancarian;* and finally, the *Synergistic* and the *Flaccian*. "On first view," we are told, "the controversies here named present a show of the greatest confusion, especially as the parties concerned in them figure in all sorts of cross combinations; the same combatants appearing as allies in one case and then again as opponents in another. In this we may see a proof, that it was not the conscious spirit of faction, but an honest regard for the cause, that determined party lines in each case. We may see, moreover, in the coming up of the controversies by pairs, how doctrines developed themselves historically through onesided antagonistic extremes, working from opposite

directions for mutual correction, and serving to bring out in full, sharp force and expression at last what each doctrine properly meant. In such view, these complicated struggles for the right apprehension of the reformation principle (necessarily more or less defective in the beginning), must be regarded as answering a most important purpose in bringing out the true sense of the Reformation. Looked at in this way, the controversial chaos shapes itself into comparative order and light. In spite of human passion and accident, it is found to proceed in the whole with regular onward movement. First, in the Antinomian and Majoristic extremes, the strife turns on the law and its significance, as forming the preliminary threshold to the right understanding of the doctrine of free grace. Next, through the ultraisms of Osiander and Stancarus, we are brought to a close determination of what is comprehended in the idea of justifying faith and the forgiveness of sin through Christ's person and work, the Gospel, in other words, under its objective view. All of which is followed up then in the third place, by the discussion of the subjective side of our salvation, involving the question of freedom and grace, as we have it in the Synergistic and Flaccian controversies. This completes the circle of principial questions. In all these controversies, it is at last a mediating view, between opposing extremes, that comes in the end to symbolical authority (though not everywhere with like satisfaction) in the Form of Concord."

It is easy to see how our History, following out this general scheme, is able to make the study of the tumultuous theological period to which it belongs, both interesting and profitable.

From the Lutheran Confession thus advanced to the high position of the Form of Concord, our attention is in the next place turned once more to the Reformed Church; whose orphaned condition after the death of Zwingli and Oecolampadius found, we are told, in the person and character of the great Calvin a new centre, and it may be said, the soul of a new life also; in the power of which it entered upon the second stadium of its general birth-period, and attained the full confessional form under which it appears in its later symbols.

We cannot pretend, of course, to generalize here, even in the broadest way, our author's very favorable estimate of Calvin's character, or the view he presents of the Calvinistic theology in its relations to the Lutheran. The two-fold principle of the Reformation (as at once material and formal), he finds distinctly recognized by the Reformer of Geneva, no less than by Luther and Melancthon; though not without some variation of apprehension, answering to the general differing standpoints of the two Confessions. This divergency of view, in reference both to the nature of justifying faith and to the authority of the Scriptures, needs to be well studied and laid to heart, for a right knowledge of the Reformed Church, and for the full understanding of the History of Protestantism generally. But we can say no more of it at the present time.

We must not omit, however, to bring forward Dorner's testimony in regard to Calvin's sacramental doctrine; "in which, as well as in the articles of sin, guilt and justification, he sought to come nearer than Zwingli to Luther;" and which entered subsequently also, we are told, into all the later and more important symbolical books of the Reformed Church—the low view of Zwingli finding in this period no favor among them whatever. The sacraments, according to this old Reformed doctrine, are not naked signs simply, nor acts merely of thankfulness or confession on our part, but pledges and seals of God's actually present grace, at once mysterious and efficacious. Such is Calvin's view of Baptism; and such also his view of the Lord's Supper. Christ, he tells us, cannot be sundered from his benefits. We partake of these only by partaking of his person. The matter and substance of the Holy Supper, then, is Christ himself in his true human life, and all the grace of the sacrament flows from this substance. The symbols in the Supper not only represent, but exhibit and offer actually what they represent; the signs are conjoined with that which they signify. Not by transmutation or natural alligation in any way, but through Christ's word and the transcendent working of the Holy Ghost.

Luther was willing to be satisfied with Calvin's sacramental

doctrine, as published a. 1540 in his tract *de Coena Domini;* and it was favorably received by the Lutheran Church generally. Still it was not in full harmony with the more rigorous thinking of that Confession; and we need not wonder, therefore, that it failed in the end to bring the Helvetic and German Churches together, and only opened the way for a second sacramental war more violent altogether than that which had ended in the Wittenberg Concord.

There are still those in this country who allow themselves to disown (with a sort of wilful obscurantism) what we have shown heretofore, in the Mystical Presence and elsewhere, to have been the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as it was held by Calvin himself and adopted by the later and better Reformed symbols of the sixteenth century. They refuse not merely the doctrine itself, as they must necessarily do from their Puritanic standpoint; but they disown also the fact of its past existence, requiring history to suit itself to their own theological preconceptions. It is some satisfaction to be able to confront this stubborn humor with the clear judgment and testimony of such a witness as Dorner, in the way we have it here given with regard to the whole subject. He even goes so far as to refer with approbation to our tract, *The Doctrine of the Reformed Church on the Lord's Supper* 1850, as full of proof for the case, and notes it as something strange in another place, that for thus "bringing the genuine doctrine of Calvin to mind, and bewailing the evils of the sect system," we should have fallen with many in America into the reproach of Romanizing.

Our obscurantists (whether among ourselves or in other denominations) may as well make up their mind to yield the *historical* question with a good grace. Calvin saw in the Lord's Supper no outword show only, no theatrical pomp, no mere imagination or mental conception. "Christ's humanity (*caro*) is life-giving, not simply as that through which our salvation has been once obtained, but because now also, in our growing union with him, his body breathes life into us, because, in short, through the mysterious power of the Spirit, which resides in

Christ's body, we have a common life with him. For from the secret fountain of the Godhead life has been wonderfully poured into the body of Christ, in order that it might from this reservoir flow over to his people. Spiritual presence here must not be taken to exclude actual presence; and if by *real* we are to understand *true* simply, as the opposite of fancy or show, then was he (Calvin) willing to allow the term real presence; for he meant nothing less than a real participation of the Saviour's body. Only he was not willing to have this understood in any common physical sense, at war with the proper conception of Christ's glorified, spiritual or pneumatic being. Like the sun, Christ streams into us the vivific energy of his flesh (*vivificum carnis suae vigorem in nos transfundit, non secus ac vitali solis calore per radios vegetamur*). Himself in heaven, he yet descends to us by his power, and works in us, breathing life into us from his body's substance. The mediating principle of this world-transcending communication is what Calvin calls the mirifical agency of the Holy Ghost, working in believers a spiritual lifting up of the soul, answerable to the *sursum corda* of the old Liturgies. For it is only the organ of faith that can receive Christ — any other view must sever him from the Holy Ghost. Not that unbelief can alter the nature of the sacrament; that would make God dependent on his creature; but it is only faith that *can* receive the offered blessing, which is immediately spiritual, although it becomes through faith of bodily force also in the end. The powers that proceed from Christ's body he seems to regard as the power also of the Holy Ghost, who however is sent from Christ, issues forth indeed from his humanity itself, to effect union with him. This union is for Calvin then a lifting up of the soul into heaven, though not of course in the sense of its quitting the body as in ecstasy or trance."

This is the Calvinistic doctrine of the mystical presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; which entered into the Reformed confessional symbols generally, in the second half of the sixteenth century; and which substantially is now embodied in the eucharistic service of the new *Order of Worship*, lately pre-

pared for our American German Reformed Church. The consecratory prayer in that service runs: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, send down, we beseech Thee, the powerful benediction of Thy Holy Spirit upon these elements of bread and wine, that being set apart now from a common to a sacred and mystical use, they may exhibit and represent to us with true effect the Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ; so that in the use of them we may be made, through the power of the Holy Ghost, to partake really and truly of His blessed life, whereby only we can be saved from death, and raised to immortality at the last day. *Amen.*" That this should be felt not to tally with the common unsacramental thinking of the present time, is not strange. It was not intended to do so. It was intended to be a solemn protest against all such grossly palpable defection from the old faith, whether found among ourselves or in other branches of the Reformed Church (Congregationalist, Low Dutch, Presbyterian, or Methodist); or a thing more monstrous to think of still, in large portions even of our American Lutheran profession itself! But there is not a clause or word in the form, that is not in strict agreement with the Calvinistic or old Reformed doctrine; and only theological blindness can see in it, or theological perverseness pretend to see in it, either the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation, or the so-called consubstantiation of the Church of Luther.

The last portion of this part of Dorner's work sketches the history of the Reformed Church, theologically considered, after the death of Calvin, through the Arminian controversy, particularly in Holland, down to the meeting of the General Synod of Dort; which may be said to have closed in a sense the period of confessional production for this Church, as it had come to its end also for the Lutheran Church, some time before, through the bringing out of the Form of Concord.

Thus we reach the conclusion of what our author considers to be the *Urzeit* of Protestantism, its primordial creative period, in which we have the bursting forth of its first general life, and the production of the still more or less unorganized

material of its subsequent history. It forms, as we have before said, the subject of the first book of his work, and takes up nearly one-half of its nine hundred and twenty-four octavo pages. We shall not follow him any farther at present. We may, however return to his History again in some future article for the Mercersburg Review. Should we be permitted to do so, we shall find the subject full of difficulty, but at the same time profoundly interesting, and of the most awakening religious solemnity. It goes to the foundations of our Protestant life, and has to do with the deepest Christian problems of the age.

One great object with Dorner in his first book, is to bring clearly into view the original and only proper sense of the material principle of Protestantism, as it conditioned and determined also, at the same time, the sense of its formal principle. On these two grand hinges, in right relation to one another, justification by faith and the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, the universal weight of the Reformation must necessarily rest and turn. But the only real foundation of Christianity, objectively considered, is Christ himself. Great stress then is laid here on the thought, that justifying faith, in the Reformation sense of the term, amounted to a real self-authenticating apprehension of Christ's righteousness through an actual laying hold of his person and life. In other words, that in which Christianity started within the soul, was held to be not just the idea of the atonement after all; but this idea lodged in the Incarnate Word, as the power of salvation back of all Christ's doings and merits in any farther view. This is all very well, and as we believe profoundly true. The article of a standing or falling Church becomes thus Christological, in the fullest sense of the term. It centres upon the person of Christ, and has no meaning or truth in any other view. Dorner sees well, that in no other view can there be any room to speak either of theological consistency or of historical continuity for Protestantism; without this, it must resolve itself into endless confusion and chaos. We may well say, therefore, that in thus maintaining the Christological sense of Luther's doctrine of justification by

faith, Dorner has in truth planted himself on what must be considered the very Gibraltar of the Protestant cause, if that cause is to be successfully defended at all on strictly Protestant ground.

But has Dr. Dorner now shown himself faithful to his great position, in making no more of it than he has done for the historical treatment of his subject? With all our respect for his high name, we must say that we think not. We cannot help feeling, all through his History, a certain theological inconsistency, by which he allows his view of the ultimate significance of Christ's person for the Gospel, to stop short with what it is in one direction only (the atoning virtue of his death as apprehended by justifying faith), while no like account is made apparently of what it must necessarily be also in other directions. Is it only the priestly office and work of Christ, then, that have their root in his person? Is not his person just as much the root also of his prophetical office and work; and so again the root no less of his kingly office and work? It will not do to confine the Christological principle here, as Dorner appears to do, and as seems to have been done in some measure also by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, to its bearing on the cardinal interest of the atonement. The whole Gospel starts in Christ, the mystery of the incarnation, the coming together of God and man in his person. This is the beginning and foundation of all that follows; and in taking in this, the faith that gives us an interest in the atonement (the material principle of Protestantism) brings into us in truth the power of his universal life, as related to the purposes of our salvation. All this we have in the Creed. There Christianity begins in Christ, and rolls itself forward in the grand and glorious life-stream of the Church. The forgiveness of sins (on which Luther first fastened the anchor of his faith) is there in its proper place; but there too are other articles, supposed to be comprehended with equal necessity in the Christian mystery—*God manifest in the flesh.* There in particular is the article of the Church, drawing after it unquestionably, not only the idea of sacramental grace which Dorner admits, but the

idea also of an Apostolical ministry by Divine consecration (as we have it in Eph. iv. 7–15), which Dorner takes pains, if we understand him properly, to let us know he does not admit. Here, we say, we feel his whole position, and the whole argument of his History to be unsatisfactory and wrong; and just here, as we have had occasion to say before, we break with the modern German theology generally, much as we admire it otherwise, because we find it untrue to its own Christological principle. The virus of Erastianism is everywhere in its veins. We are willing to meet all parties, German or English, on the basis of the Apostles' Creed; but, God helping us, we will not consent to stand with any of them anywhere else.

ART. V.—SCHELLING'S IDEA OF ACADEMIC CULTURE.

Vorlesungen ueber die Methode des Academischen Studium, von F. W. J. Schelling, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1830.

Schelling very properly introduces his Lectures on Culture with the remark, that discussions of this kind are important, not only to the teacher and student, but also in the direct bearing they have on the progress, tendency and character of science itself. Schools of learning, if they be pervaded with anything like life and power, and are not simply the tread-mills of a dead routine of worn out traditions, may, therefore, be expected to exert an influence that goes beyond the college walls, and be felt in every sphere of life, but especially in the impulse and direction they give to the pursuit of knowledge under all its diversified forms. This remark seems to be conclusively verified by the lectures before us. Whilst they throw much light on what might be called the German idea of education, they at the same time present the sciences in their proper organic connection with each other, and invest them with a dignity and value, which they would in vain claim as they stand by themselves, in-

dependent of all such general relation. The lectures, indeed, apart from the philosophy of culture, with which they abound, are equally as rich and suggestive as it regards the philosophy of knowledge or science. They embrace, in a brief, and as might be supposed, comprehensive form, the philosophy of Schelling, the best and the most Christian, approximately, of the modern German systems; not so clearly understood by themselves, but interpreted in the light of his latter writings, clear and intelligible enough to every one, who is willing to give them a careful perusal.

It is, however, mainly on account of the many striking, profound and original thoughts in regard to higher educational training, with which they abound, that we bring them before the readers of this Review. They will not in fact be found to be entirely new to many of them, whom they will no doubt remind of the culture, which they themselves received at our own institutions both at Mercersburg and Lancaster.

According to Schelling, and all others, with whom the work of education is a matter of the heart, the student as he enters upon his academic career, needs constant counsel, direction, and guidance in his studies. As the world of knowledge opens up to his view, he feels instinctively that here, at least, there ought to be unity, order and harmony; but in that same degree, in which he feels this necessity, must he also be oppressed with the feeling, that he stands in a world of chaos, in which he sees nothing in its true and proper place; or, out on the wide ocean, without compass, chart, or guiding star. Few, can depend on their own internal resources, to direct them to anything like a rational end or object of pursuit. Many endowed with good organizing heads and hearts warm with love for study, at the start, feel as if it was their business to master every branch of knowledge and manifest the most commendable enthusiasm in the pursuit; but, as they study without regard to order or system, they are at the mercy of multifarious tendencies, and without penetrating to the germ of any subject studied, they find, after they have learned something by experience, that they have also learned much that is of no account, whilst they have ne-

glected much that is truly valuable. Others possessed of less sterling qualities, appalled at once by the magnitude and range of knowledge, become resigned to what seems to be their lot,—to herd with the commonalty, to give up all aspirations for a higher, spiritual education, and, as a consequence, to strive, by forced efforts of industry and mechanical memory, to master only such branches of knowledge as may be of use to them in promoting their future material prosperity. Or, as might be expected, with no safe guide, or no resources within themselves, to give direction to their studies, they fall under the influence of bad teachers, with whose lower grade of cultivation they can more readily sympathize. From these considerations it will appear that students need direction in their academical pursuits; and of course, the novel practice of allowing them to select for themselves the branches which they wish to study, in the same style as guests at a hotel select from a bill of fare such articles as they suppose will make them a good dinner, would be ruled out in every system of education, which claims for itself a rational or scientific character.

But there is a consideration, upon which Schelling properly lays great stress, for the most part overlooked in the practical education of our times. Universally, the particular has value only as it stands in living connection with the general, which is something higher and more permanent. This, of course, is no less true in education than in the arts and sciences, and there must be, accordingly, two kinds of culture, one that is general or universal, the other specific or particular, a distinction of much importance, and one that lies at the foundation of all culture as a real, living process. But as experience goes to show, especially in our own country, the object of most presons, who aspire to what is regarded as a liberal education at college or university, is not so much a generous, an ennobling universal culture, as something in itself of priceless value, as it is to become eminent as a good engineer, a good lawyer, a good doctor, or a successful preacher. The consequence is, that the true mission of the educated man is very indifferently fulfilled. The community, and especially the uneducated classes, instinc-

tively look up to those who are educated as models of manhood, and not simply as professional men, who for a consideration will look after our bodies, our souls, or our temporal possessions, They expect to see, as they have a right to do, in those occupying such prominent positions, the highest examples of culture and refinement, of intelligence and nobility of character. And when these are wanting, law, medicine, and divinity are no longer professions, but simply trades, and just as likely to secure for themselves nicknames, indicative of quackery and vulgarity, if not of meanness itself. Against such a one-sided culture, colleges and universities, where the more general sciences are studied, have to a greater or less extent endeavored to protect the student; and it cannot be denied that the academical course pursued in our better institutions of learning, so far as it goes, is well adapted to secure this object. Mathematics, in particular, as a purely ideal science, having nothing to do with material substances, purifies the mind and prepares it for the reception of rational knowledge of every other kind. But as Schelling maintains, philosophy, which touches the human subject on all sides, is especially adapted to elevate the mind above the limitations of a one-sided culture into the realms of the universal and absolute. As the universal science, the science of science, as the organizing power in the domain of knowledge, which professes to reduce an almost interminable diversity to a transparent unity, philosophy, if there be such a thing, certainly has the strongest claims to be regarded as the *sine qua non* in all true culture. It is absolutely essential to the idea of a full and complete education, which to have *reality* must be special, but to have *truth* must also be general. Here, then, we may say, we have the idea of all true culture or education.

But just here the student's difficulty commences. He is not exactly in a position to see for himself such a living connection between what is universal and specific in culture; and philosophy, that etherial mistress of the sciences, dwells so much on her azure heights, that she seldom descends far enough to point out this connection; so that the ingenuous youth, who is not

unwilling to be led by universal, transcendental, absolute ideas, is tempted, through sheer dismay, to give up the pursuit altogether, rather than to waste his time in fruitless efforts to orient himself within such captivating regions. This remark, we think, has much force as it regards German philosophers generally, at least to an American mind, though it must be confessed, that we cannot complain so much of Schelling, in this respect, as of Hegel and others. He had a much higher regard for realities, and possessed, moreover, a wonderfully creative, an almost poetic genius, and has probably succeeded better than his compeers in showing the true, normal connection between the universal and particular in the wide range of knowledge.

The case, however, is not a hopeless one, nor should any one, much less a youth, who aspires to be a *free man*, and not a mere hod-carrier in science despond, nor imagine that it is his lot to be excluded from the region of the universal. Citizenship there may always be obtained by honest effort for its attainment.

Much will be accomplished, if the student is merely taught that there is such an organic unity in the domain of the sciences; that it is important that he should know something of the irrelative position in this totality; that there is a general life or spirit, which gives beauty and harmony to the whole; and that his future profession, whatever it may be, must be to him as well as to others a dead, spiritless, one-sided, contracted affair, which he cannot fill with becoming dignity and self-respect, except as he has some definite conception of its relation to other callings, and to that grand organism of which our universal human life consists.

So also the courage and strength of the student to acquire such a culture will be vastly increased, if he looks at the signs of the times, and sees how urgent and important it is in the deeply interesting period of history in which his lot is cast. Sixty years ago, when Schelling was only thirty years of age, he recognized the deeper tendencies of history towards unity, and seemed to foresee what is coming to pass under our own

eyes at the present time. What he said in his own day is finding ample fulfilment in our own: "that everything in art and science seems to suffer violence in its struggle toward unity, laying hold of every element in its sphere, even what is apparently the most insignificant, and marshalling it into line; whilst the slightest movement at the centre is sure to propagate itself with amazing rapidity to all the parts or members however remote; and a new and more general theory is called for, that is capable of comprehending all the facts in the case. Such an epoch, he remarks, cannot pass by without the birth of a new world, in which those who have no active sympathy must be entombed or reduced to nonentities. This powerful undercurrent towards unity, which the penetrating philosophers of Germany long ago detected in their times, and which their philosophy had much to do in originating and promoting, has shown itself within the last few years on a gigantic scale. Look, for instance, at Germany herself, which, in a brief period a little more than a year ago, by one grand leap, made such a huge advance towards national unity, the goal for which her people have been longing for centuries. Look also at Italy and England, and even Spain, which has been struggling for a higher unity and a better organization now for many years. At the late outbreak of our own troubles, a distinguished English statesman asserted that, as it is the lot of some nations to go on towards a greater degree of consolidation, so it is the manifest destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race to split and divide itself, and a very general fear that this would prove true in regard to ourselves came to prevail among ourselves during the war. But notwithstanding these predictions, and notwithstanding the fact, that the war was precipitated upon us by anarchic, disintegrating elements in the north as well as in the south, the result was an emphatic assertion of the principle of unity, a veritable *lucus a non lucendo*, a transformation of the everlasting Satanic Nay into the divine, the ever blessed Yea, in which disunion itself may be said to have wrought out the beautiful problem of our national unity. These and other facts of the same import are, however, only typical, we have reason to suppose, of a deeper, though less

palpable movement in the spiritual world towards law, unity, harmony and freedom. They speak volumes of hope and good news for science, philosophy, for theology, and above all for the Church of Christ and humanity at large. Now, the work of education, if it is to be a living thing, and not a mere dead tradition, cannot allow itself to make no account of these controlling tendencies, these life powers of history. It must partake of the character of the age; it must lay aside its exclusive particularism and strive after universalism and catholicity. It is only in this way that young men at school or college, to whom the control of this world-regenerating process must be soon entrusted, can be at all properly prepared to attend intelligently to their high and responsible duties. A single graduate, possessed of this kind of universal culture, is worth five hundred others, who have gone through a routine of studies with a keen eye to their future success in business or a profession, but without such an ennobling comprehension of himself and his work in one grand process or totality. This kind of education presupposes a love for the universal, the absence of onesidedness; and it must, therefore, be acquired, if acquired at all, for the most part, in youth, whilst the individual has enthusiasm and susceptibility, and has not yet been petrified by outward forms, and the claims of the business world have not as yet crushed out all the germs of a higher and nobler existence.

But where shall such a culture be obtained, and to whom shall the student entrust himself in this important matter. In the first place, we answer this question, by referring the student to himself and his better genius as a safe guide. Let him bring himself to see and feel for himself, that he is not merely a citizen of some little pent up Utica, but of the world at large; that he is a living member of nature and a factor in the world's history; let him know that neither the one nor the other is a mass of dead matter, but that each is an organic process proceeding from one Author: and when he once sees this, he has the key of all knowledge, and of all true culture; and it will only be a question of time, whether he will make any progress

in the acquisition of true wisdom. Still here, as elsewhere, he needs the enlightening and enlivening power of the teacher's presence and the teacher's words; and, as a matter of course, he should be directed to such teachers as believe in the universal, and have given proof of their capacity to show that there is such a thing as universal science, a knowledge of knowledge, and have enthusiasm enough to awaken in others a love for universal thoughts and ideas. It will not do, therefore, to go to those who do not believe in philosophy, who profess not to understand such mysticism, and who try to throw cold water on everything that savors of true philosophical enthusiasm; nor to those who are so devoted to specialties, as to ignore or forget that there are entire worlds beyond their own little gardens, which they have cultivated with such exquisite care and attention. Specialties are, of course, proper in their place; but they are truly valuable only as they stand in an ennobling general culture, as their proper maternal soil. Accordingly, we say, we ought not to confine ourselves to such countries as Great Britain or our own, immersed as they are to a great extent in gross materialism, much of whose philosophy consists in stubborn efforts to prove that there is no such a thing as philosophy properly so called; but, proving all things and holding fast to that which is best, we should extend our tour to such a country as Germany, the classic soil of rational philosophy, where more perhaps than anywhere else the ideal world has something of the character of reality, and the real has been truly ennobled by its elevation into the region of the ideal. We may here also point to our own institutions, where some account has been made of a spiritual way of thinking; where philosophy, Christian philosophy has all along maintained a greater predominance than in any other institution in the country.

Now the kind of culture here advocated depends on the view which is taken of knowledge as a whole; upon the question whether there is such a thing as a science of knowledge, or whether all true knowledge is so inwardly connected, and connected as to form a single unity. Schelling tries to show that this is so by means of the fundamental principle of his

philosophy, his far famed *Identitäts-Lehre*. With him it was an object to avoid the absolute idealism of his friend, Fichte, whose system seemed to divest the external world of all outward objective existence, and to reduce all knowledge to mere inward subjective states or conditions of the mind. The claims of the real world entered, therefore, largely into Schelling's system of thinking, and were abundantly sustained amidst the wide-spread scepticism of the times. Not however to founder on a rock on the opposite shore, because men in trying to avoid one extreme are prone to run into another, he held just as firmly to the ideal world as he did to the real. He maintained that, so far from there being anything like opposition or antagonism between the two, as might be inferred from the contentions that have been continually springing up between them from the early dawn of philosophy, back to the times of Thales and Pythagoras, they are identical. This identity, however, can never be felt nor maintained except as these two orders of existence are seen to proceed and flow from a higher unity in what he calls the absolute, which is God, the source of all the diversified activities, which we witness in the sphere of nature and mind, and, at the same time the light, which discloses to us their relations to each other and to the whole system in which they stand.

Of course, it is not necessary here to show how Schelling attempted to trace out the process by which the endless diversity, which we witness within and without us, unfolds itself out of an original unity. Here he displayed a range of intellect, an architectonic skill and power, which must fill his readers with amazement at the resources of his mind. He has perhaps not succeeded in all respects with the solution of this vast problem; and certainly not in the view of the philosophic world. It would indeed be strange if he had, when we consider the slow process, which has as yet been made in unfolding the mysteries of the universe and our own being. Philosophy to be a science, must not necessarily have accomplished this fact. Pythagoras, from a feeling of disgust at the pretensions of those who claimed that they knew all things, was unwilling that

it should even be called wisdom, *σοφία*, and so gave it the more modest title *φιλοσοφία*, the love of wisdom, the name, which it still bears. From this it would appear, that it is not bound to give a complete intuition of all truth, but that it is rather, as its name imports, a striving after truth, and communion with its source in God. It is enough for us to know that there is such a thing as truth, underlying the universe, and that it is all one organic process, whether it has been presented to our view in a perfect outward objective system or not. Plato may have failed in this as we know he did, and so may Fichte, Hegel and Schelling; still that does not invalidate the position, that there is such a thing as philosophy, a universal, necessary truth; just as little as the divergent systems of Christianity prove that there is no true Christianity in the world.

Of course, if there be no such unity embracing all branches of knowledge, there is no need of further discussion, and our only alternative is to fall back upon our old treadmills, and grind away stubborn facts and old traditions as best we can. There can be no such a thing as a universal culture; no such a process as a *humanizing* process going forward in the elevation of our race; it is all relative, empirical, local, limited to times, places, and circumstances. But it would be difficult to admit all this in the face of history, and the universal tendency of men everywhere to philosophize from the shoemaker's bench up to the Academy, the Lyceum, and the University. In special branches of knowledge an internal unity is always regarded as a postulate, as a necessary preliminary condition. Each science tends to form itself into an organism, pervaded with a common life or spirit, which its professor borrows from the world of ideas. This is the case, for instance, with the science of Mathematics, which is constructed out of principles borrowed from a world beyond that which is real and tangible. Numbers, quantities, points, lines, surfaces, triangles, and spheres, are not there considered as things that can be seen or handled, but as ideas. These enter into the formation of the science as their life-blood, just as they entered at first into the creation of the material universe. But, if special sciences are

thus organically connected in themselves, why should we not suppose that they are organically related to each other so as to form one beautiful whole? The knowledge of this unity and of its principle forms a species of rational, unconditioned science, an *Urwissen*, out of which, in different grades, numerous branches unfold themselves in symmetrical order, so as to form in the end, that grand majestic tree of wisdom, under whose overhanging boughs the nations sit in admiration.

All this is confirmed by the results of science as they are brought to light from day to day. Not only do special departments of nature show in themselves an organic process, but many indubitable and well-defined traces have been brought to our knowledge from the sphere of nature as a whole. Geology has shown that our globe is not what it now is by virtue of any sudden or magical power, but that it is the result of a process or genesis, carried forward for a long period under the constant direction of the Divine mind. Traces of this progress towards the present mature form of our planet, properly called "footsteps of the Creator," are seen everywhere, on the tops and sides of mountains, deep down in mines, or in the bed of the ocean. Every where are indications and proofs that it was once without form and void, and that it rose out of chaos as a growth, as an objective, intellectual system. Astronomy here joins hands with Geology, confirms its results, and soaring aloft into the wide universe, predicates its unity, and maintains that the whole system of material things out to the most distant fixed star, is the result of a still grander process, of a simply genetic development of divine activities and thoughts. Thus, we may say, that all the discoveries in nature go to establish the intuitions of science, and to confirm that earnest conviction which Christianity has fixed in the human mind, that as there is only one God, so must unity, harmony, and order, every where characterize his works.

Knowledge is then organic, no less than nature and history, of which it is the other side, that is, the ideal. This brings us to a point of view from which we may at once see the value and dignity of science in general as well as of particular departments

of knowledge, as means to the highest culture of man. Each is a free unity by itself, and is in itself an end. No one science can be regarded as a means to another, nor is it to be regarded as such in any course of education. Thus it is often urged, in colleges and elsewhere, that philosophy and metaphysics are of no real value, except as they sharpen the intellect, and thus prepare the student to master other sciences more practical and useful. So, on the other hand, it is equally as great a mistake to suppose that the natural sciences have their use only as they serve the interests of those that are more intellectual. Such an idea of science is a purely mechanical one, and does violence to that organic relation in which they stand to each other, and that living unity which holds them together in mutual dependence. If one branch of knowledge is not its own end, but only a means to some other one, it becomes difficult for the student to have much respect for it, and he must study it very mechanically; whilst the professor, under the impression that he is simply carrying up brick and mortar through the hot sun to the top of the building, can hardly be expected to engage in his work with a high degree of enthusiasm. All branches of knowledge are doubtless mutually dependent on each other, and some are more important than others. They mutually shed light on each other, and no one can be fully understood without some knowledge of the rest. But it is derogatory to any one if its value is made to depend simply on its relation to some other one co-ordinate with itself. Each is an end in itself, whilst all in their turn become a means in their relation to the totality in which they find their life and truth. So it is in the State, which is perfect and entire only as its branches or departments of life and activity are left free to unfold themselves in harmony with its general life, without bar or hinderance from the other. So also in the work of education. "The more," says Schelling, "the teacher regards his department as an end, the more even he makes it the middle point of all knowledge, and strives to extend it into an all comprehensive totality, so much the more will he endeavor to invest it with general and universal ideas; whilst, on the other hand, the

less he is able to give it a universal sense or meaning, whether he is conscious of it or not, he will give it the mechanical character of mere means; because that which is not clearly comprehended as an end, by a sort of inevitable necessity, will come to be used as means, and must to that extent be degraded." Must then every teacher be a philosopher in order that he may do justice to his department? We answer, certainly, as much so as possible; and the more so, the more likely it is that he will give to his science the interest of a new charm, and awaken in the minds of his students a sense for the universal in full sympathy with his own. This also implies that philosophical training should not be put off until the student gets away up somewhere in the university, where it is served out to him in order, in a few lectures near the end of his course. No more so, we would again say, than that this should be the case with the moral, the æsthetical, or the religious, all of which imply the highest flights of philosophy. All training should be philosophical, just as it should be ethical and theological. The tendency to generalize, to organize our ideas, to philosophize, often shows itself quite early in youth, with other noble tendencies of our nature, and it should therefore meet with encouragement by providing for it a congenial atmosphere from the start no less than at the end of a course of study. We are all more or less by nature philosophers as well as theologians, and what we need most in these circumstances is encouragement and right direction to these tendencies. The school, therefore, which can impart no genial impulse in this direction, is sadly defective in that which should constitute its very life as a seminary of learning; and the teacher or professor, no matter what may be his enthusiasm for his science, becomes one-sided, and is stripped of all power of reaching and stirring up the deeper and more powerful instincts and tendencies of human nature. Religion and morals may be taught, but it will be done, for the most part, in an outward, mechanical way. These interests have life and power only as they appear in their proper place and connection in the system to which they belong. Not even Logic or Mathematics can be taught with safety, unless

the instructor fully understands their connections and relations. If he be an unbeliever, indifferent about truth, or unable to defend it, the case is still worse, and involves danger to the interests of education. It is an instance in which the individual has no proper call to his work.

We have thus seen what relation the co-ordinate branches of knowledge sustain to each other, and to that totality in which they all meet; we have also seen with what spirit the particular branches should be studied. The particular must never be subordinate to itself, but owes in all cases its homage to the general. Thus education becomes general and universal, and as such is also an end in itself; and it ought never to be regarded as a mere means. It is, of course, an essential and necessary preparation for the learned professions, such as law, divinity; for experience goes to show that these callings cannot be filled with dignity and honor, without something like the universal education which we have been advocating. But if this is the only or the main object of an academical training, it is reduced to a system of hod-carrying on a more extensive scale than in the case which has been considered, in which one branch of science is prostituted to serve the interests simply of another. We cannot speak in terms too exalted of the dignity of the learned professions. In every community they are or ought to be its highest ornaments; in fact, pillars in holding up the most sacred interests of society. But culture, we maintain, is an interest that is higher, because more general and universal, than these specialties. It is certainly something grand to be a merchant prince, an engineer, a skilful physician, an advocate of right and justice against wrong and oppression in the community or State; and it is something still grander to be the messenger of glad tidings to men ground down in the chains of ignorance and sin; but, as we take it, it is something grander still to be a *man* in the proper sense of the term, to be a *man*, cultivated and ennobled, with a clear perception of his position in the universal system of things in which he stands as a living member, to be a Christian man with a clear consciousness of all his relations in time and of his im-

mortal destiny hereafter. Here the universal aspect of the case must be allowed to have the precedence over the particular or the specific. It is the natural, the necessary order. There is, however, no contradiction or antagonism; on the contrary, harmony, in which is found the only true solution of the great problem of life. To be a man in the proper sense of the term, cultivated, elevated and refined, is not at all antagonistic to the idea of an active and useful member of society. On the contrary, it is the life-ground, the foundation, the only true basis, on which every special activity of life should rest, in living union with which it is to be made to bloom and blossom as the rose. While therefore it is an animating thought to the teacher, that the students, with whom he meets from day to day in the recitation-room, are destined in a few years to occupy stations of honor and usefulness in the community, it is a still more animating thought, that he is giving them that general Christian culture, which will not only enable them to discharge their relative duties, but also adorn, beautify and ennoble society itself.

In consecutive lectures, Schelling goes on to show the relation of Philosophy to the various departments of Science, to Mathematics, to Physics, to Medicine, to Jurisprudence, and to Theology, and it is truly refreshing to see how these treadmills are elevated and ennobled when held up in all their ideal relations. But time will not allow us to trace them out, interesting and profitable as it might be, except in the case of Theology and Christianity. This must be done in every theory of education, else the whole subject is left floating in vague generality, and must lose all distinctness of character.

We have seen that all knowledge is organic, and that as a consequence all culture is also organic. We have seen what a free relation the particular branches sustain to the whole, and the whole to the particular. This can exist and be real only as the whole process proceeds from some definite origin, source, or principle. This, as we shall see, must be sought in Christianity. On this point, Schelling has given utterance to many profound and beautiful thoughts; not so much in the lectures

before us as in his later productions; and simple justice to his great name, as well as justice to the subject before us, requires that we should at least briefly refer to them.

It is sometimes said that he was the author of two systems of philosophy. The first he unfolded during his younger days with gigantic power of thought and concentration. This was regarded by some as nothing better than a refined system of pantheism. Then he became quiescent for almost a quarter of a century, during which he was in a manner forgotten and overshadowed by the illuminism of the Hegelian school, which became the rage throughout Germany. But many of the disciples of Hegel drove philosophy into the ground, and gave rise to wide-spread infidelity in the sphere of religion and Christianity. Under these circumstances, Schelling was searched out in his retreat, brought to Berlin, and placed on the cathedra, with the hope on the part of the friends of orthodoxy, that he would say something in favor of Christianity, and counteract in some way the baleful influence of Hegelian infidelity. This was an event which produced a sensation throughout Germany, much as political movements are wont to do in our own country. Without satisfying everybody, he acquitted himself in a noble style, like a Christian Plato, before the assembled University of Berlin, with eminent professors, jurists, and divines among his auditors. His services in bringing German philosophy back to Christianity, were similar to those of the great Schleiermacher in the department of Theology. He then unfolded what has been called his later system, which, it has been thought by some, cannot be reconciled with his previous views. He did not, however, think so himself. He regarded the first as simply negative, while the second was to be positive and supplementary to it; and he was accordingly unwilling to admit that there was any conflict between them. Simple justice to his memory requires that the one should be understood in the light of the other.

According to Schelling, Christianity is essentially *historical*, as opposed to the view which makes it to consist in a system of doctrines, dogmas, or morals. It is a divine revelation in the

sphere of history or the ideal world. The religion of the ancient Greeks was also a revelation, but one that was confined to the sphere of nature; here the infinite was shut up in finite forms, which themselves became deified, and polytheism was the natural result. The symbol became identified with the thought, which it was made to embody, and hence there could be no history or development in a religion of this kind; the only progress that was possible, consisted in the multiplication of gods and the increase of idolatrous worship. But it was quite otherwise with Christianity, a religion in which the infinite and eternal constituted the main thing; where the finite was thrown into the back ground, it was no longer adequate to represent the infinite even as a symbol, and was reduced to the subordinate position of a parable or allegory. Such a religion could not become objective in the fixed forms of nature, but in the progressive aspects of the ideal, human, historical world, in which the divine passes by each person, and must be embraced by faith, because it can no longer be held fast by the quiescent forms of the natural world. In order that such a religion may become a reality, it was necessary that the infinite and divine should enter the finite, not to deify it, but to impart to it life and activity, and to produce a reconciliation between the two worlds. The fundamental idea in Christianity, therefore, is the incarnation of the Son of God, which took place just when the ancient world was tending towards inevitable dissolution and was constrained to confess its own helplessness. Christ brought down in himself the infinite into the finite, and drew towards himself humanity not in its purity but in its fallen state. As an historical appearance, he passed back again into the spiritual world, and for himself substituted the Spirit, the active principle, which brings the finite into union with the infinite, and as such is the light of the modern world. Such a power introduced into the world's history cannot slumber in the forms, in which it is embodied, as in the old heathen systems of religion, but meeting with obstacles, obstructions, and contradictions in the natural world, which it has to surmount or destroy in order to bring about unity and reconciliation, it pro-

duces convulsions, and gives rise at times to such displays of divine power as constitute miracles, wonder works, or other revelations of the divine through the natural. History thus, by its connection with Christianity, assumes a new character, and becomes in some degree the symbol of the divine. But this is simply a light shining in a dark place, and it is necessary that the divine should be enshrined in a form commensurate with its purely ideal character. This it finds in the Christian Church, the highest form of history, a living work of art, which, while it embodies all the Christianity in the world, is the only means of revealing it to the world. Such a revelation of the divine in an historical form is something progressive, extending from one century to another, ever presenting the same mystery, but under different aspects, according to the position from which it is viewed. At one time its distinguishing character was Petrine, carrying with it the power of *law*, as we see it in the Catholic Church; then Pauline, in the Protestant Church, asserting the *freedom* of the Gospel, and finally it will be Johannean, in the Church of the Future, in which all contradictions will be reconciled under the gospel of *love*.

Thus spoke Schelling in an age, when philosophy ran mad, encouraged doubts in regard to the existence of the external world, and reduced Christianity to a system of empty notions or myths. Even in our days, when the Church is regarded at least as something, we have reason to thank him for his emphatic utterance, that "*Christianity is not doctrine, but fact, —history.*"

Under a profound conviction of the reality of Christianity as the most inward living force in history, Schelling had a profound contempt for the superficial rationalism of his day, and maintained that "Christianity was everything or nothing." As the latter horn of the dilemma was one that the most ordinary common sense must reject, he further maintained, especially in his later writings, that Christianity as a world-embracing fact, must be the "middle point" of all true philosophy, in connection, with which alone all other branches of knowledge can be viewed in their proper relation. "The universe itself," he says,

"can be regarded as real history, as a moral kingdom, only in the light of Christianity, and only in union with it has it a true, fundamental character." Theology, the science of Christianity, therefore is the highest form of philosophy, after which follows the philosophy of nature and history in their regular natural order.

From this it will be seen, that, if culture is to be philosophical, it must also be Christian and theological; that it cannot claim to be philosophical, unless it is at the same time distinctively Christian and orthodox. Philosophy, as the universal science, might with as much consistency, ignore the world of mind or nature, as to set aside the moral order, which God Himself has established in our world, and then claim for itself the character of true wisdom.

Whether Schelling succeeded in making Christianity in all respects the central point of all philosophy and culture as he proposed to do, there is doubtless room for some divergency of opinion. It is, however, in fact, immaterial to us whether his system of thought shall be found in the end to harmonize fully with Christianity or not. What is most important as it regards the subject in hand is his testimony to the general fact or truth, which, coming from one in his position, from one who had traversed every department of knowledge, not superficially, but with profound earnestness, and had penetrated to the profoundest depths of science, was the highest achievement, which he could have made in the search after truth. In our days, when French philosophers, like Cousin, while professing to do all honor to Christianity, see nothing in it, but what is coördinate with other powers in history, it is something certainly to hear a great philosopher say that it is much more, that it is the grand synthesis or comprehension of all others combined in organic union. A wiser one than Schelling has said, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The life-penetrating relation between Christianity and all true culture, necessarily brings the school into right relation to other forms of life, the family, the State, and the Church. These are, so to speak, independent organs of activity, but they are all

intended to work harmoniously together for the same general result, the elevation and glorification of the race. The progress from the family to the school, from the school to the State, and Church on earth to the Church above, is all one and the same.

The idea of education, which is here advocated, is, of course, German, and is realized to a greater extent in the German university than it is anywhere else. Can it be realized in such a practical country as our own? Certainly not, unless it can find somewhere among us a favorable soil. As an exotic, with nothing in our state of society to appropriate it, it must fail if the attempt be made to introduce it. Institutions and Schools of learning that spring up among us naturally partake of the character of the communities that originate them, and represent truthfully the character of their culture. Hence such a thing as a university in the German sense of the word would require at least considerable change of views and taste, in regard to the character of a higher education, in those who attempt to realize such idea.

The question then arises, can we expect any such change in our American life as will prepare the way for the kind of culture here advocated? There would doubtless be difficulties of no ordinary character, in our prevailingly practical character, in long-established prejudices, and perhaps also in our social and religious life. But, if the thing in itself would be beneficial, these difficulties ought not to be considered insurmountable. Indeed, if our good practical common sense could be brought to see that institutions imparting such a training as is given in a German university, would be an honor and a blessing to the country, there is no doubt but that the way would be speedily opened for their establishment. So it is in other things that are considered important and valuable. There is no nation on earth that is more open and free to transplant foreign ideas than we Americans, when it is believed that they can be turned to account. The misfortune with us all along has been, that we have been frequently too ready to embrace foreign ideas, and so have grasped the evil rather than the good

of foreign countries. With all our efforts to promote the cause of education, with the princely donations of government and private individuals, we have not a single institution in the country which is prepared to give the culture which is imparted at German universities. Some would say that we do not need it, as we have something better. But all this is simply whistling to keep our courage up, and it is practically denied by the scores of our educated men, who have been frequenting German universities, with the view of acquiring such a training as will more fully qualify them for stations of honor and usefulness in this country. When we consider our resources, and the characteristic energy of our people, which is appalled by no difficulties, it is indeed strange, when we reflect upon it, that, with our many schools of learning, admirable in their place, we have none that is in all respects qualified to take the place of a German university, and to afford its advantages.

But, whatever may be the practical difficulties in the state of society generally, as it regards the establishment of such institutions, they certainly ought not exist in the German dispersion in this country. The German communities are remarkable for the tenacity with which they hold on to their language, their customs, and, we may say, also, to the German spirit. Why should they not, then, consider it their vocation to realize the highest ideas of German culture and German life? Who should, we might ask, if they should not? Here is a work in which they may most appropriately engage with profit to themselves and their children, and with the guaranty that in this way, more perhaps than in any other, they would confer the greatest boon upon the country and their fellow men. It was in this way that the fatherland has become a blessing to the world at large. Divided politically, with no means to exert political influence, debarred to a great extent from the commerce of the world, and limited in its natural resources, by her schools and universities, her books and learned men, she is exerting at the present day a deeper, if not a wider influence on the history of the world, than England, with her commerce and wealth, or France, with her military and political influence.

So far as our own communion is concerned, it is well known

that American Germans have not been altogether untrue to their name and antecedents in their efforts to promote the interests of a higher education. Limited and contracted as we may say these have been, the spirit, the soul, the ideas of true culture, such as we have described it, has been energetically present among us for many years. Truly Christian and philosophical training has been aimed at and successfully maintained in our seminaries of learning. The views of the book we have been reviewing were the views of Rauch, the first President of Marshall College, and they have become the views of those who have followed him, whether as teachers or students. All this has been done against opposition from without, and still greater difficulties within, arising from the want of means and resources to make our institutions what they ought to be. To enable a school of learning to realize its idea, it must have all the means and appliances necessary to carry out its work. It must have libraries, apparatus, and it must have the men and the moral strength in its faculty to make it effective. In this respect our college, energetic and successful as it has been with its meagre resources, has not by any means been a favorite of fortune. Much of its history consists in its heroic and self-sacrificing efforts to maintain its existence, and to keep up appearances. It is gratifying, however, to know that there is a feeling abroad in the Church, that byegones should be byegones, and that the time has arrived, when more liberal things should be devised for its interests and efficiency. This, we think, ought to be encouraged. We have arrived at a juncture, when it is felt that the Church, or liberal men of wealth in our communion, should place our educational affairs on a vantage ground, and give our college at Lancaster an impulse, which would make it truly a power in the land. In no other way, perhaps, could we confer a greater blessing upon the country at large, the Church of Christ, or our own people. It may be truly said to be a golden opportunity, which it would be extremely unwise for us not to avail ourselves of. In this we would share the sympathy and prayers of all patriotic and Christian men. By faith and prayer the object can be accomplished.

ART. VII.—THE VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE CHURCH.

BY REV. D. GANS, D. D.

There are some who make this expression to mean two separate and independent things. Instead of regarding the visible and invisible as d fferent sides of the same Church, they resolve them actually into two Churches. Hence you often hear them speak of a visible Church as something altogether whole and complete in itself; and in like manner also of an invisible Church as being finished and entire, as such, without any necessary relation to its visible form or manifestation. The error which is here committed should be palpable to every mind. It is the old dualistic sundering of what God has joined together—heretical to the core. It is the insidious heresy of the Bishop of Constantinople, of the 5th century, which first attacked the Person of Christ, and then, and as a consequence, the Church. Man also is visible and invisible; and it would manifestly be just as reasonable to say, that either one of these sides of his nature is complete and independent in itself; or that together they constitute, in fact, two men instead of one. The error has long since been theoretically driven from the field.

There are others, who think they are doing wonders in the way of combating the old heresy of dualism, when they acknowledge the existence of a relation between the visible and the invisible. It is clear, however, that this does not in the least relieve the case, as long as these two sides of the same thing are regarded as separately complete, each in and by itself. If they can be thus complete, then it still follows, whatever relation may be supposed to exist between them, that they constitute two Churches, and not one. Moreover, the relation itself, which, in these circumstances, is allowed to hold, or which is at all conceivable or possible, between the visible and the

invisible, never comes, nor can come in fact, to anything more than a mere outward and mechanical connection. The separate completeness of the two sides can admit of nothing deeper or more real. If this relation were regarded as inward and vital, it would at once induce the perception and actually constrain the conclusion, that neither aspect, thus related to the other, could be the whole; for in this case, the very necessity of such a union of the one with the other, would show its incompleteness in itself, and also demonstrate its essential dependence upon the other. There is, therefore, no escape from the heresy of dualism in any such superficial and mechanical view.

Plainly, the case requires the union of the visible and the invisible in a *vital* and *organic* form, in order to the completeness, not of two things, but of *one* and the *same thing*, namely, the Church of Christ. Just as man is not body, nor spirit, but body and spirit, and just as he is not both these in the form of separate completeness, but *vitally united in one person*, so the visible and the invisible, *organically united*, form one Church. These are therefore the different sides only of one and the same thing. The *unity* is the essential element.

It is equally plain that the visible is the side towards man, and that the invisible is the side towards God. The same thing meets us in the ever glorious Person of Christ, and it is in this, especially, that we see His adaptation to our condition as Saviour. He is our Saviour by virtue of this fact. By His divinity He stands organically related to God, and by His Humanity He stands related in the same way to man, and *thus* He is our Mediator. This is the regulative law for the Church, which is His body. Man is concerned, first of all, with the side of the Church which is nearest to him, and farthest from God. God begins to move towards man through the invisible, which is next to Him; man begins to move towards God through the visible, which is next to him. God and man meet in the *union* of the two, which is the Christian Church in its true, whole, organic, and proper character. This is enough to show the fallacy as well as the folly of the idea, that we must first be members, some how or another, of the invisible side of the Church before we

can be received into the visible. It is unnatural in every sense, and so far as man can see, an utter impossibility. We can find no divine objective means to accomplish such an end. God has never ordained such means. As well indeed, might a man, in taking a journey, try to start at the point where he hopes to end. The very reverse of this is the true order of procedure. We start from the point at which we are, and thus hope to reach the point at which we aim. We begin with the side of the Church which is towards us—the side which, on account of its visibility and tangible humanness, is adapted to us; and, taken up in this, we are led to the invisible, because of the vital relationship which holds between them in the objective constitution of the Church itself.

This truth, so clear in itself, has for its illustration the whole world of Nature so far as this has become known to us. In no department do we get to essences *directly*, but always indirectly, namely, through the outward forms and signs of essences. We know the invisible only as it is borne to us in the visible; and we reach it practically just in proportion as we penetrate the outward form which is nearest to us, and thus actually enter the organism, of whatever character it may be. We do not study the essence of a plant in order to understand its outward form and structure; we do not first seek to understand the soul of man, and then, by means of this knowledge, try to understand his body. Everybody knows that we always proceed, and are compelled to proceed just in the reverse order. So from the visible in the Church we pass to the invisible—from the outside, and the side which is next to us, we pass to the inside, and the side which is most remote from us, and nearest to God.

We all feel this even in the order of the words forming the caption of this article. Who would think of saying the *invisible and visible Church?* Every one feels that there is an awkwardness in such an arrangement, that it is unnatural. It is placing that first which proper order requires to be placed second. The *visible and invisible* is the order that meets our feelings, and which leads us to say it is right, although, intel-

lectually, we may be able to assign no definite reason for our feeling. It is the unconfused testimony of our deeper consciousness, through which the analogy of the world under all other forms, uniting with our experiences in all other departments, expresses itself. Here we have the kingdom of Nature teaching parabolically the order and constitution of the kingdom of Grace. From the known we rise to the unknown—from the visible to the invisible.

Still, as already seen, no mode of representing the case dare be allowed to involve a dualism. Words and phrases, here as well as elsewhere, must take their meaning or peculiar force, from the things to which they are applied. When we speak of reaching the invisible through the visible, we do not thereby mean, that the invisible is not *in* the visible, that it is not *one* with it, that it is something separate from, and lying beyond it. The Church is not visible *and* invisible, but a *union* of the two. The Church under this aspect is more than visibility simply added to invisibility in a mathematical way. Visibility + invisibility is not=the Church. The Church is the *union* of these two in the power of *one life*—one life indivisible by its very nature. This is vastly more than the two in juxtaposition. To allow of a sundering, or to admit of two separate values under any real form, even for one moment, is to allow at the same time of an utter destruction of the very being of the Church itself, just as you have physical death when the union of body and soul in man ceases. This union of the two sides was the ground of that old saying—"Extra ecclesiam salus nulla;" and of those other words no less venerable and weighty: "Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem." That which we *see* of the Church is, therefore, never mere form. Here is just the point at which so many seem to make shipwreck. An organic sign is never a sign only, but the embodiment also of the life of the organism in which it holds and which it represents and proclaims. Such persons do not steadily hold the union of the visible and invisible, but take these as separable, or as existing each for itself, or at most as being merely mathematically *added* together, in such a way, that

the visible never actually, and in any necessary form, embodies and represents the invisible. What is this but down right Nestorianism over again in its very worst form? Hence it is difficult for such persons to conceive of real sacraments at all, either in the early or Reformation sense of the word; for in both these senses the sacraments, in their formal character, are regarded as holding vitally in the unseen essence of Christianity. Conceding the possibility of the invisible, in ordinances which Christ has appointed, being separated from the visible, it is not hard to regard all that appeals to the eye, and which God has thus made to come near to man, as merely *formal.* The doubt, thus started, necessarily tends this way. At least, where this possibility of separation is allowed to hold in any legitimate divine ordinance under its objective form, there can be no assured *confidence* for the spirit of their union at any time. Thus the ground of positive faith is broken up, the power of certitude is destroyed, the testimony of sacraments is entirely lost, and everything touching the Church is rendered uncertain, shadowy, and unreal. In this way man is sent into the endless confusion of his own subjective nature for the evidence of the presence of the unseen, which he would otherwise find in the holy sacraments, and which our Catechism plainly teaches us to look for in them. Ques. 73.

But at this age, it is felt by most men that this dualistic theory involves entirely too much, and that unless it be effectually checked by some means, it will prove fatal to the whole practical interest of Christianity. It is evident to most minds, that neither the visible nor the invisible, separately taken, constitutes the Church of Christ, and that to regard either of them, as such, is a most hurtful delusion. Here is the prolific source of dead formality on the one hand, and of the wildest forms of fanaticism on the other. If the visible *can be* where the invisible *is not*, *there* you have not the Church; or if the invisible *can be*, normally, and for the practical purposes of salvation, where the visible *is not*, there, again, you have not the Church, but "some other way" of deliverance; for the Church consists in the presence of these two sides united in the power of one

common life, and in this view is the object of faith according to the Creed. The invisible life of an organism is always in and pervasively commensurate with its sign or visible form. We believe there is no exception to the rule. Therefore, to conceive even the possibility of their separation, in the present application of the subject, much more so to regard this separation as at any time an actual fact, is virtually to deny the Church altogether. And this is evidently the result to which the cry of empty and vain formality, as touching any of God's legitimate ordinances, must come in the end. If the visible does not *embody* the invisible in a real way, then there is no actual Church of Christ in the world, just as, if the body does not in like manner enshrine the soul, there is no actual man in the world. There may be a visible *and* an invisible—there may be a body *and* a soul, but the two not vitally *in* each other and forming one life, there is no Church—there is no man.

But if these two things *are* one, and *must be* one to meet the demands of the case itself, then why speak of a visible and invisible Church? Why speak of empty forms and vain ceremonials? Why speak of "water baptism" as distinguished from the "baptism of the Holy Ghost" (two baptisms and both divinely appointed!")? Why speak of the Holy Supper as bearing no grace, and the necessity of feeding upon Christ in some other way? Why all those pious warnings against trusting in God through the ordinances, which he has ordained, as if they were all so many mere deceptive signs and cheats? Would there be room at all for any such language, if it were steadily believed, that the visible and invisible are one in the deep, organic and sacramental sense of the word—making but one Church, one baptism, one eucharist? In this view it would be felt that, as physical eating is, because of its being outward, formal and in the flesh, no mere vain formality in which the spirit has no actual interest, so the formal act of baptism, and the outward eating of the bread and drinking of the cup, the proper conditions being at hand, are not pure formalities which result in no gracious good, so far as "spiritual religion" in the soul may be concerned. Institutions are always the embodi-

ments of organic laws, and are therefore always essential to the life in which they stand. The institutions of grace (and pre-eminently so the Holy Sacraments) stand vitally in the *union* of these two sides of the Church's being, and, therefore, in themselves they must really embody what they represent and proclaim. *Man* may imagine functions to exist where there are no faculties, or set artificial eyes where there is no vision, and then trust to their guidance. This *would* be formality. No such mock appearances, however, can be attributed to the institutions which God creates. The visible and the invisible, necessarily being one in the Church of Christ, His body, there can be no room to conceive any organic part or function of it to be formal only. Every such part or function must, with its formality, be also a vitality.

ART. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

REPORT on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and Canada, made to the Legislature of New York, Jan. 1867. By *E. C. Wines, D.D., LL.D.*, and *Theodore W. Dwight, LL.D. Albany:* Van Benthuysen & Sons' Printing House, 1867.

This Report of between 500 and 600 pages, is well worthy the attention of the American public, and especially of those who feel specially interested in the welfare of society. It has already called forth no little discussion in the leading periodicals of the country. The subject seems to be claiming special attention at this time, both in this country and in Europe.

Humanitarianism regards crime as an error and a misfortune;—only this and nothing more. Hence punishment looks only to the protection of society and the improvement of the offender. This theory contains a fundamental error, in overlooking the element of crime, and the necessary connection between guilt and penalty. There is something more than society to protect; the law must be vindicated. This is an eternal necessity. The criminal is punished first because the law requires it; and this requirement rests originally in the necessary relation between law and punishment. If it were perfectly certain that a criminal would never afterwards injure society, yet having committed a crime, the law would require his punishment. So also if it were certain that his punishment would

serve in no way to reform him, or do him good, yet his punishment would be none the less necessary and right. It is not the end of punishment to reform the criminal. This, we take it, is the fundamental position to be assumed by the State on the subject.

Yet it does not follow from this, that the good of society or of the criminal has nothing to do with punishment. It connects itself very intimately with such punishment, and in this view demands attention. "The science of punishment, the philosophy which investigates the treatment of criminals, holding the just balance between coercion and reformation, must have a profound interest for all lovers of the human race." The Report investigates the subject from this point of view. There is much in it to interest all who are concerned for the suppression of vice and the promotion of public morality.

OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE. By *A. E. Kroeger.*

A pamphlet of thirty pages. We do not know who Mr. Kroeger is, nor who publishes his article. We only know that it is above the usual style of speeches and articles on the subject of our government.

Self-consciousness requires a relation between a multiplicity of individuals. Each individual, as he claims for himself free moral self-determination, must recognize the same in others. Each individual has a right to *life*, that is, a right to the body as a whole, the body being in the sensuous world the rational being itself. Each individual must retain exclusive determination of his own body. No one has the right to compel a physical action not determined through the will. In other words, complete moral freedom is guaranteed to each individual in guaranteeing to him this right to life. He has the right of *liberty*, that is, freedom of bodily movement. Hence the meaning of the *habeas corpus;* the right of emigration, &c. The *pursuit of happiness* is the right of property to all the sensuous world. He is entitled to his share, either landed estates, or some branch of business, &c. His sphere of causality, no matter what that sphere is, is his property, as soon as it is recognized by his fellow-citizens.

"But an agreement of each with all, to respect each other's freedom, affords no security that the rights of each will be respected; on the contrary, it is based on the very supposition that each will not respect the rights of the other. Hence the necessity of a power to compel each person to respect that agreement; and hence, also, the necessity of entrusting this power to a third party." Here we get the idea of government. It is the most respectable statement, as contained in the pamphlet, of the idea of government as developed from a rationalistic standpoint. The account given in the pamphlet of the early growth of the nation towards its present form of govern-

ment is the best we know of, showing that the Puritans, least of all, started with our idea of freedom. "Freedom was not what the Puritans wanted, but authority-worship." Hence they persecuted the Quakers, and banished Roger Williams. An opposite spirit developed in the South, running, in some cases, to the extreme of utter lawlessness. Then we have the nature of our government as it finally came to be settled, through the struggle of the three representative theories of Henry, Hamilton, and Madison, a thorough discussion of the whole subject, winding up with the conclusion, that our government is proper and good, and as such, entitled to the confidence of the people, and that all we need is to complete and perfect it, according as its incompleteness and imperfection may be discovered. Only this and nothing more. The pamphlet is in double columns, and contains quite enough for a full elucidation of the subject.

But, with all its ability, it seems strange to us, that such a subject can be discussed, from beginning to end, without any reference to God, or His law. If we can start to reason on the basis of *self-consciousness*, can we not as well take in the equally patent fact of man's *God-consciousness*. Government is not an invention of man, but a divine institution. Not divine as given by express formal direction, which would require a revelation; but based on the authority of the divine law, as applied to man's social nature in his civil relations. We must get up to this before we can form a true theory of government. All human rights, after all, rest upon man's relation to a law which is above him, stands over him, but which he is to seek to make the law of his own reason and will. It is most important in our day, that the conception of government as of divine authority in this sense, should become general among the people.

The Atonement. By the *Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D.D.* Prof. of Didactic, and Historical and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

It was our intention to notice this book somewhat at length in the present number of the Review, but we have been compelled to postpone carrying out this intention until the next number. Meantime we have a few words to say in regard to it in this place.

In one view it would seem that it need not arrest particular attention; for it merely enunciates and argues the extreme Calvinistic theory of the Atonement as it is taught in the Seminaries of the O. S. Presbyterian Church. As, however, this extreme view has been toned down considerably of late years in the pulpit teaching of that denomination, it seems like a new effort to hold the Church up to the line of the most rigid orthodoxy on this subject. In this view, it is intended to arrest particular attention on the part of the members of that denomination. It seeks, moreover, to prove to all other Churches, that this is the only orthodox theory on the subject,

and that it has been thus held and taught by the Church in all ages. It thus seeks to challenge the attention of the theological public generally. Accordingly it has already encountered opposition in various quarters. The Lutheran Church, as represented by the *Lutheran and Missionary*, answers it with vigor, and the *American Presbyterian* of Philadelphia, a New School organ we believe, dissents from its positions likewise.

The theory of the atonement which it enunciates is as abhorrent to us, as is to the author what he styles "the semi-pantheistic Monism of Schleiermacher (wonder if he can pronounce this name) and the American *Mercersburg Theology*," or that "Mercersburg Theology which has its roots in a pantheistic philosophy and a Romish religion." In this last reference the author quotes from Dr. J. W. Nevins (this name he does not know how to spell, and he would perhaps find as much difficulty in spelling out his thoughts).

1. The book advocates, as earnestly as though he had the Bible all confessedly with him, the outward, mechanical, theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. God entered into a covenant with Adam, by the terms of which it was agreed, that the first man should stand as the representative of his race. When he sinned his sin was imputed, according to the terms of this covenant, to all his descendants. How these descendants become sinful is another question, and the author admits that in some way the generic unity of the race has something to do with the matter. "Without going the length of Realism, it appears probable that the divinely ordained representative and substitutionary constitution, alike of the probation in Adam and the redemption in Christ, is conditioned upon the generic unity of men as constituting a race propagated by generation." But after all, this generic unity is only a secondary matter. Man becomes guilty because God imputes to him the sin of Adam. Dr. Hodge thinks it is ridiculous to say, that Adam's sin is made ours by "an ordinary physiological law of generation." Is, then, generation only *physiological?* and has it nothing to do with man's psychic and pneumatic nature likewise? "The effort to prove man a sinner on this scheme ends in reducing sin to the category of transmissible physiological accidents, such as red hair or a prognathous skull." A profound view truly of the mysterious fact of human generation! Of course we do not believe at all, that the Bible teaches any thing like this Covenant of Works theory, nor the manner in which it is here taught man becomes sinful and guilty before God. Dr. Hodge will have to write a good deal more before he succeeds in showing, that the Bible and the Church do not teach Realism, in making Adam the generic head of the race. We doubt even whether he has led Dr. Shedd to see, that he is all wrong on this subject.

2. This book then goes on to explain that God now made another covenant with His Son, by which it was agreed that Christ should become a substitute for the sinner and suffer the penalty of sin in his

stead. God imputes our sin to Christ, and Christ suffers the penalty. When that is done God is satisfied, and frees the sinner from judgment. But inasmuch as all are not released from judgment, it must follow that the satisfaction could not have been made for all. The application of the atonement is just as broad as its provisions. Hence Christ did not die for all, as applying to the whole race, but only for the *all* of the elect! This is the doctrine which, we remarked above, the pulpit teaching of the Presbyterian Church has toned down. Their ministers do not preach generally, that Christ died, not for all men, but for only a part of the human family. Such a doctrine finds too much in the Bible against it. Hence it must be confined to Theological Seminaries, where a certain theory of *irresistible* grace is made logically to rule the whole system, whether it can carry the Scriptures with it or not. We do not believe that Dr. Hodge can prove that the Church in all the past has held this system, nor persuade the Church of the present to adopt it. It is far worse than the "semi-pantheistic Monism of Schleiermacher and the American Mercersburg Theology."

3. The theory of the application of the atonement now follows. A satisfaction having been made, the penalty paid, God now proceeds to apply its benefits to all who are entitled to it. Being freed from the penal consequences of sin, they must now be regenerated and sanctified. This is a new work which God performs in their behalf, without any necessary connection with the person of Christ. The author says in one place, p. 319, "We believe that God could have changed man's subjective moral condition by the direct action of his Holy Spirit upon the human soul, without an objective exhibition of his love by means of such a sacrifice as that made in the person of his Son." That is, the work of saving man in its subjective aspects, his regeneration and sanctification, his resurrection and glorification, this work does not stand in any necessary relation to Christ, except as He, by paying a certain penalty, made it morally possible consistently with the justice of God. We do not wonder that such a theology runs out into barren orthodoxy, and becomes a mere dry skeleton, abhorrent to all who have learned to look upon an *organism* in the full play of fresh, vigorous life. We would like to see Dr. Hodge's exegesis of John vii. 39.

No, we feel an abhorrence for this theory of the atonement. Dr. Hodge argues against the Governmental Theory, and the Moral Influence Theory, but we think this *Juridical Theory* of his is not a whit better. We think the *Generic-headship Theory* is better than they all. This, Mercersburg Theology, in common with the teachings of the Church in the past, and all the better theology of the present, firmly holds. It only needs to be stated in comparison with the other theories named, in order to see that it answers fully to the teachings of Holy Scripture, and goes far to remove the sore difficulties with which this subject is environed in its scientific explanation.

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL INDEX. By *R. G. Pardee, A. M.*, Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues & Co., 148 South Fourth St., 1868.

A little volume of about 250 pages, gotten up in the very best style of the art. If the outward appearance is a recommendation of a book, the publishers have certainly given this volume the very best recommendation.

The author has also done his work well. This book sets forth the results of a faithful study of the Sunday-School system, and an experience of forty-five years. We say results, for he gives directions and conclusions, as the title indicates, without wearying the reader with the mental processes through which he passed in reaching the results. It is a most excellent guide, or hand-book for those who are engaged in the Sunday-School work. Thus much, and more, may be said commendatory of the book, judging it from the author's point of view. We are glad to find, also, that he seeks to place the Sunday-School in proper relation to the Church. "The Church of Christ is the grand centre and radiating point of all our Christian efforts." He pleads, too, for placing the Sunday-Scool under the guidance of pastors. This is right. A Sunday-School which seeks to carry on its operations independent of the pastor, assumes a position which must be condemned. And so, on the other hand, it is the duty of a pastor to see to it, that this important interest of the Congregation pass not out of his control. It is an institution whose powerful influence over the young of his flock he is under obligation to guide and direct.

At the same time our convictions require us to say, that we are not by any means satisfied, that the Sunday-School system, as it stands at present, rests on the proper basis. It is an existing institution of immense power, and it cannot, therefore, be ignored. A wise pastor will seek to turn it to the best possible account. Yet such Churches as seek to maintain a system of Catechisation, such as the Episcopalian, Lutheran, German Reformed, and (we ought to be able to add) the Presbyterian, must feel, that the Sunday-School by no means covers the ground, or answers the want of Catechetics. It ignores teaching in the true catechetical sense, because it seeks to instruct from the Bible without the medium of Creed and Catechism. It ignores, to a large extent, the status of baptized members of the Church. It cannot, therefore, properly train the children of the Church with a view to Confirmation, which is the goal of Catechisation. It ignores the distinction between the baptized and the unbaptized. Without referring to other evils connected with the system, these are enough to lead such Churches as those referred to, to regard it as a system which needs close care and watching lest it prove disastrous to their best interests in this direction. It makes all the difference in the world in what light the children of the Church are regarded, and with what end they are religiously instructed. Hence those Churches which seek to maintain catecheti-

cal instruction, find no small difficulty in using the Sunday-School for their purpose. The only thing that can be done is to seek to make it the catechetical class of the congregation, so that the teaching of Scripture may be placed in proper relation to the Catechism. The fathers of the Reformed Church used to write as a motto on the Catechism, "*According to this rule, search the Scriptures.*"

One of the first things to which the Reformers turned their attention was, the preparation of Catechisms for family and congregational use in the religious instruction of the young. A Catechism is not a book to be laid on the shelf for occasional consultation by adult members on questions of orthodoxy, but it is to be constantly used in the instruction of the young. For these and other reasons that might be given at almost any length, we cannot but feel that a system, which tends to cultivate a spirit adverse to Catechisation in the churchly sense, is fraught with immense danger to the Church. We do not believe the Reformation Churches can ever be satisfied with the work of the Sunday-School as a substitution for the work of Catechisation in its broader or narrower sense.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with numerous illustrations and maps. Edited by *William Smith, LL. D.* Hartford: J. B. Burr and Co., 1868.

This work in one volume, double columns, of over 700 pages, has just left the press. It is one of the best works of the kind with which we are acquainted. For those who have not access to any more extensive work, such as the Encyclopedia, it is of the highest interest. The Editor, who is Classical Examiner in the University of London, and Editor of the Dictionaries of "Greek and Roman Antiquities," "Biography," and "Geography," has called to his aid over seventy of the first theological writers of Europe and America. The larger work comprises three large octavo volumes of over three thousand double-columned pages in small type. The present is an abridgment of that work. It is reduced to such dimensions as will place it more readily in Christian families. We commend it as one of the best works for families, as well as for all who are called to aid in teaching the Bible in any capacity.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1868.

Art. I.—DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

The Second Book of Dr. Dorner's work is devoted to what he calls the *Sonderleben* of the two Protestant Confessions, and the *Wiederauflösung* of the original principle of Protestantism. The period embraced in it reaches from the first part of the seventeenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches, originally and constitutionally different forms only of the same general movement, more or less conjoined in their actual previous history, are regarded as now falling asunder, and running each a separate course through several generations; an intermediate historical stadium, which must be considered in this view unsatisfactory and wrong, while it served, however, to prepare the way for the ultimate union of the Confessions again, as it may be trusted, in the power of a higher and better life. It is characteristic, then, of this period of sundered existence still farther, that it was attended also with a sundering of the proper Protestant

consciousness itself on the part of both Churches. The unity of the original Protestant principle (as at once material and formal), underwent a gradual dissolution, resulting at last in the reduction of the principle under both views to sheer weakness and inanition. This also, however, must be taken as a transitional stage of church life, designed to make room for the restoration of what was the proper idea of Protestantism in the beginning; and the great theological problem for the present age, accordingly, is to re-assert, both practically and theoretically, the original Protestant principle in its full compound force, in a way that shall place it triumphantly above all the errors that have attended its wrong development, down to the present time.

Only in this way, Dorner thinks, is it possible to vindicate "either the justice of the Reformation itself in the sixteenth century, or the right of Protestantism now to look upon itself as having any legitimacy from that great revolutionary movement." Mere outward succession here, in other words, is not enough; without the bond of a common life, without comprehension in the principle of the Reformation as a positive actual force, the boast of lineal descent can mean nothing. Without this, all comes at last to poor empty negation; and Protestantism has no history which is not at the same time the argument of its own unsubstantial existence.

The Birth-Period of Protestantism, the age of confessional production, was followed in both divisions of the new Evangelical Church by an age of scholastic theology, in which every effort was made, with vast outlay of strength and learning, to organize the religious material of the Reformation into full scientific form; whereby it might appear in proper harmony with itself, and be properly distinguished, at the same time, from the errors of Rome in one direction, as well as from all false irreligious extremes in the other. It lay in the very nature of this school divinity, that it should stand in a certain sort of outward opposition to the original freshness and vigor of what it was required to study and explain; and we find throughout a tendency with it, accordingly, to substitute the

theory of religion, in some measure, for the actual life of religion. Orthodoxy was made to stand too much for the whole sense of Christianity; in which wrong position, then, it failed to secure its own object, and became itself unfaithful to the very cause it was intended to support. Especially was this the case in regard to the main citadel of Protestant Christianity, the right union of the material and formal sides of the original principle of Protestantism. All here depended on the living relation of faith to the word of God as comprehended primarily in Christ Himself, and could be firmly and steadily held only in the element of the actual life to which it belonged. As an object of mere reflection or outward scientific contemplation, the mystery is found to become more or less unsteady; its two sides lose their necessary coherence; faith no longer carries with it its own rightful assurance; and then the word, also, turned into a simply mechanical authority, is shorn of its proper power, and proves unequal altogether to what is required of it, as taken to be now in such abstract view the pillar and ground of the truth.

In this portion of his History, our author directs his attention first to the Reformed Church. The reign of orthodoxy here, or what he calls "one-sided objectivity," is made to reach to about the close of the seventeenth century. The Reformed theology of this period comes before us under a most respectable and imposing character; passing from Switzerland over to Holland, strengthening itself in different parts of Germany, flourishing for a time in France, and finally attaining to credit and distinction also in England. Holland became famous throughout the world for its universities and great theological names. The Synod of Dort, claiming to be of œcumenical authority for the Reformed Confession, made the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination to be a necessary part of its orthodox faith. But this met with much opposition; not only in Germany, through the influence of Lutheranism, but also in Holland, France, and England, by a reaction from within the bosom of the Reformed Church itself. All this gave rise to great controversies; in the course of which the material and formal sides

of the Protestant principle both suffered damage, in a way that made room finally for a general irruption of rationalistic unbelief. The old orthodoxy, held up for a time in Switzerland by the *Consensus Helveticus*, gave away at last in full about the year 1700, making an end of this whole scholastic period for the Reformed Church at large.

Of special importance as a reactionary force against the scholasticism of the period, was the celebrated school of Cocceius (J. Cock), an eminent German divine, whose labors in Holland told with immense effect for a time on the theology of the whole Reformed Church. To understand his position, and what he accomplished in this view, it is necessary to glance at what had come to be the general theological posture of the Protestant Church in his time.

The circumstances of Protestantism, according to Dorner, necessitated in the progress of its development a resort to philosophical scholasticism, for its own explanation and defence. The two Confessions, however, applied their studies here in different ways. The being of God (theology in the strict sense), they accepted in common without any original inquiry; then, however, while the Lutheran theology directed its attention to Christ's benefits (justification in particular), as the marrow of the Gospel, the thinking of the Reformed Church fastened itself mainly, not, indeed, on God's being, as now said, but on God's decree, in such manner as to see all history comprehended in it, as it were *sub specie æternitatis*, without room for any real human agency whatever. Under such unchangeable constitution, there could be no resolution of history into great periods or ages ruled by different principles; even the fall of man itself could form no such distinction, but must be considered the coming out simply of what was required by God's decree from the beginning, for the accomplishment of its ultimate purpose. God is in full harmony with Himself through all, looking to the end of all from first to last, the salvation of the elect through Christ. History in such view, of course, ceases to be history in any proper sense of the term. Human freedom has nothing to do with it. It involves no real movement whatever.

But the want of a proper historical view of religion was not confined in this period to the Reformed Church. "The Lutheran scholasticism also," Dr. Dorner tells us, "failed to reach the idea of an actual history of redemption, including periods and stages, for humanity at large; all it recognized was such history in the case of single souls, whose salvation then was made to turn, not on God's decree, but on His truth made known for the purpose through revelation. This truth must be the same, it was assumed, for all times; and therefore salvation was at hand for men under the Old Testament, before Christ came into the world, in the same form in which it is at hand for them now, since His coming, under the New Testament. In this we see at once a tendency to one-sided intellectualism in the conception of saving faith, and at the same time a general want of clearness, as in the age of the Reformation itself, in regard to the relation of the Old Testament to the New. For, keen as Luther's observations frequently are in this direction, particularly where he contrasts the Law with the Gospel, it did not come still with him or with the Church at large, as his own commentaries on the Old Testament show, to the firm apprehension of any real difference of religion under the two dispensations. The Form of Concord says indeed what is true, when it tells us, that the Gospel is to be found in the Old Testament, and the Law also in the New Testament; but if we are to allow at all the force of our Lord's own distinction of periods (Matt. xi. 11, 12), this must not be so taken as to trench too closely on the absolute newness of Christianity. The identification of the two dispensations in the Lutheran Church, doing away with the idea of historical development, and raising the Old Testament at once to the level of the New, found support in the hypothesis that the Old Testament saints saw Christ and His work of salvation prospectively by faith; and that as for the unchanging nature of God, all history is comprehended in a single glance, causing the future to be felt as present, so the historical value of the atonement also must be allowed to carry with it in this way a retroactive force. This view was promoted largely, moreover, by the reigning doctrine of inspi-

ration, which made God to be the exclusive and sole author of the Scriptures (without any recognition of a true human concurrence in their production), and then, as all sound interpretation must aim at giving the *full* sense and mind of an author, was led irresistibly, out of regard to the immutability of God's purposes and counsels, to seek in the Old Testament also what were known to be the truths of the New Testament; as being necessarily the only whole and adequate expression of God's meaning in His own revelation, and capable of being apprehended as such, at least by true believers."

In this way, we are told, the Lutheran theology, no less than the Reformed, failed to reach in the seventeenth century the conception of a real, living historical movement in the work of the world's redemption. But the identifying view of the Old and New Testaments was aggravated somewhat perhaps, and made more mechanical, in the Reformed Church, by the stress which was laid there on the absolute sovereignty of God, in connection with the doctrine of predestination.

Keeping all this in view, we may understand the significance of Cocceius and his "theology of the covenants." He stood in the bosom of his time; moved in the Reformed system of thought; and found Christianity, himself, quite too indiscriminately in the Old Testament. But his heart was warmly in the Bible, and his studies here carried him out of the beaten track of the schools. The great business of theology, in his view, was to ascertain the mind of God in the Scriptures. He has been charged with teaching that the sacred text must be taken to mean all that it can in any way be made to mean; but his view was simply that the sense of the text, in any case, is not to be limited or measured by what was in the mind of its human composer. For the whole authorship of it being of God, according to the common orthodox judgment, the wholeness of God's knowledge with regard to its subject, must be considered as entering into it; so that whatever it can be made to mean by this standard, must be counted as belonging in truth to its legitimate sense. Under this general view, theology became in his hands altogether biblical; and the idea around which it

revolved was that of the covenant. Others before him had made much also of this idea, particularly Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism; but it was under a one-sided view mainly, as seeing in it only a relation of God to man. Cocceius first made earnest with the double character of the relation, as depending on conditions, involving acts, and carrying along with it the force of real history. This was at once to unsettle the doctrine of an abstract decree, made to be the principle of the world's salvation in the Calvinistic sense. Not only the supralapsarian scheme of necessity, but the infralapsarian also, was made to bend and give way more or less before such a view. It was an immense matter to have the feeling of a historical process, the sense of differing economies brought home to the consciousness of the Church in this way. No wonder that the scholastic orthodoxy of the time felt itself disturbed by what was felt to be so serious a breaking away from its authority. Its controversies with the Cocceian theology, reaching through many years, while they were successful to a certain extent in exposing the defects of this scheme, served at the same time to bring out the inherent weakness of the reigning theology, and helped on the reactionary tendency which robbed it finally of all its force, and caused it to give way entirely to the subjectivism and rationalism that carried all before them in the course of the following century.

Our author finds in the Cartesian philosophy another far-reaching cause which, in his opinion, wrought powerfully and deeply, as a silently undermining force in the same revolutionary direction.

After noticing in such general way the course of theology in the Reformed Church on the Continent, Dr. Dorner passes to the consideration of its history during the same period in Great Britain. Here there might seem to have been, at first view, no movement in common with the continental life of the Confession. But we have, in fact, the same general law at work, our author thinks, on both sides; only under a difference of character, answerable to their different spirit and genius. What we have on the Continent predominantly in the form of thought and in-

tellectual production, meets us in England and Scotland in the form of will, practical production, external organization, political and social life; with special regard also in England more particularly, to all that pertains to cultus or public worship. In neither of these countries, we are told, has a scholastic theology, or rigidly scientific orthodoxy, ever been able to strike root. The idea of objective religious authority has, instead of this, embodied itself in real outward arrangements and constitutions; over against which, then, the heteredox has run always naturally to like outward expression in the form of church separation and schism. These practical activities, however, are only in their way what the theoretical activities show themselves to be in another and different way. History as a whole, in both cases, turns on the relation of authority to freedom, as these oppositional forces are found incessantly struggling, through all antagonisms, to reach some satisfactory reconciliation and peace. Thus we have the idea of authority in Great Britain represented under the form of an established church polity, Episcopalianism in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland. The ecclesiastical struggle between the opposing forces here corresponds in some measure with the confessional war on the Continent; as it ends also in a sort of like general exhaustion and dead formalism on both sides, making room for the insurrection of private judgment and private will, in a way that brought on finally a reign of general unbelief. The reaction of the subjective principle against objective authority, gave rise to the Independents or Congregationalists, to the English Baptists, to the Quakers, and other unsacramental sects; and then finally, also, to the Deists. Deism rose in England during the latter part of the seventeenth century, and flourished steadily on till about the middle of the century following. In Scotland, the inward course of things was substantially the same. The old church orthodoxy sank into lifeless formality, and there also, as everywhere else, the eighteenth century became a period of wide-spread scepticism and unbelief.

In the Lutheran Church, the parallel historical movement through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, according to

Dr. Dorner, is of a more measured and regular character; carried forward by parties, which were held together always in the same ecclesiastical communion, and which found themselves forced in this way to come to a more thorough understanding of their differences. Here we have again, in the first place, a period of one-sided objectivity, a time of scholastic orthodoxy, devoted to the work of expounding and defending theologically, on all sides, the religious acquisitions of the previous age, as they were held to be embodied particularly in the Lutheran symbolical books. The great matter was to hold fast, and hand forward safely, the traditional faith received from the Reformation fathers. It was, for Germany, an age of famous theological schools and mighty theological men.

Specially deserving attention here is the history of the Reformation principle. It underwent gradually serious modification and change. For Luther, as we have seen, faith and word (the subjective and objective sides of the principle) were indissolubly joined together, though each had still its own relative independence; the direct apprehension of the Christian salvation itself in Christ, was that which authenticated the truth of Christianity; and the assurance of this truth, therefore, was not the result, in the first place, of any divine certification of the biblical canon, but came simply from the laying hold of what forms the matter of the Bible, the gracious doings and promises of God, and, above all, the great fact of justification through faith. This article of justification, then, was not with him one simply among other doctrinal propositions; it lay at the root of the whole Christian life itself, as well as at the foundation of all Christian doctrine. In the seventeenth century, now, we find the demand for unconditional certainty in religious things still actively in force among German theologians; a demand, that could not be satisfied without reaching directly to the highest source of evidence, as it is found only in God Himself. It was not considered enough to set the testimony of the Scriptures above the outward authority of the Roman Church; this testimony itself must not be a mere outward authority, but must be received as an inward personal assurance wrought in the soul

by God. So teach in harmony with Luther and Chemnitz, we are told, John Gerhard, Hülsemann, König, Calovius, Dannhauer, Dorsch, Quenstedt, and Hollaz. Neither do these great writers mean to treat Christian truth as a merely theoretic interest, or to sunder the knowledge of it from the sense of its saving power; theology they hold to be a practical state of mind (*habitus practicus*) directed toward eternal salvation. We cannot say, therefore, that the union of the formal and material principles which formed the pivot of the Reformation, was altogether lost sight of in the seventeenth century. Even where systematic divinity is made to begin with the Bible as its only principle and foundation, it is still always on the assumption that the truth which the Bible teaches has become matter of experience to the theologian, and that he stands through faith in the felt sense and assurance of what he is here called to expound.

So much must be granted; and yet how different the spirit of this seventeenth century is, after all, from that of the Reformation period! In what does the difference consist, then? and how is it to be explained?

According to Dr. Dorner the difference lies in this, that the theology of the seventeenth century no longer held the material principle of the Reformation (the assurance of faith authenticating its own object, God's justifying grace), as of co-ordinate force with the formal principle, the authority of the Bible, but allowed it weight only in the form of dependence on the Bible, and indeed only as its effect and product. This might not seem to amount to much; but it was, in truth, a falling away from Luther's standpoint, which drew after it most serious consequences.

Two polemical references contributed to this unconscious change of base. First, the Catholics held all appeals to personal God-wrought convictions as no better than fantastic private judgment, against which they arrayed then the supposed sure authority of the Church; and so in controversy with them it was felt necessary, instead of standing on any such personal assurance, to have recourse only to what both parties were ready to acknowledge, namely, the divine authority of the Holy Scrip-

tures. Then secondly, however, the Anabaptists and other fanatics, reversing the Catholic view, affected to plant themselves wholly on the material principle (personal assurance), making no account, comparatively, of the formal (Bible authority). So, on this side again, there was a strong motive with the orthodox theologians, to lay all stress upon the Bible; and thus altogether it was that the proper co-ordinate authority of the material factor, as this entered into the original full principle of Protestantism, fell gradually more and more out of sight, while it became more and more an object to establish the divine sufficiency of the sacred canon as in and of itself the only pillar and ground of the truth.

Dorner finds a progressive movement in this one-sided direction throughout the seventeenth century. The deviation from the old view took place by gentle, hardly observable degrees. Hunnius and J. Gerhard go a certain length in making the personal assurance of salvation subservient only to the argument for the authority of the Bible; Calovius, Dorsche, Quenstedt and others, go farther; till finally the "witness of the Spirit" to God's truth is made to resolve itself entirely into the divine authenticity of the sacred canon, and the assurance of what is taught in the Scriptures as *doctrine*, without any regard whatever to the direct appropriation of the truth itself in its own living form. "By this subordination of the assurance of actual grace to the assurance of biblical doctrine and the divine authority of the Scriptures, justification by faith was robbed of its fundamental significance as an argument for the truth of Christianity. For the assurance of grace is simply the certainty of such justification. Another way was fallen upon for the certification of Christianity; namely, the self-authenticating power of the Scriptures themselves through the Holy Ghost dwelling in them, both as to their contents and as to the divinity of their form. Thus deprived of its fundamental force, the material principle of the Reformation could take its place only as one among other articles of faith in the body of the theological science itself; whilst, on the other hand, it became now a settled maxim, that the *Scriptures are the only principle of theology.*

They must, then, be clothed with full qualification for this position, so as to be able to bear up alone the whole weight of doctrinal orthodoxy. It was not enough for them to remain any longer as the trustworthy original record only of the Christian revelation, the fountain of genuine Christian knowledge, and in this way the norm and test for everything claiming to be Christian; they must serve also as the source of evidence for the *truth* of Christianity itself, and (through the formal use of reason) as the only and all-sufficient means of establishing all theological doctrines. What was taken from the material principle, as witnessing through the direct consciousness of God's justifying grace to the divine character of Christianity, and so to the certainty of Christian truth, was now attributed to the Bible; and the Bible was put forward in such sort, that the whole view taken of its inspiration, as compared with Luther's standpoint, underwent essential change, making it to be, at once, in, and of itself, the self-sufficient, self-upholding, and self-evidencing presence of all divine revelation."

That such change in the central standpoint of the Lutheran Church should make itself felt, more or less seriously, on the progress of its theological thinking at all points, is only what might be expected; we cannot pretend, however, even to glance here at the way in which Dr. Dorner pursues this observation in its details.

The one-sided objectivity of the Lutheran orthodoxy, like that of the Reformed system, called forth opposition, not only from without, but in time also from the bosom of the Confession itself. Modifications of the Protestant principle, at war with one another as well as with the reigning school divinity, but showing jointly the necessity of a more profound and comprehensive construction of Christianity and theology, come into view in the first place, according to our author, under three different general forms. These he makes the subject of separate consideration, under the titles of Protestant *Mysticism* (represented by such men as Paracelsus, Weigel, Lautensack, Stiefel, Jacob Böhme, Gichtel, Petersen and Poiret), *Calixtinism* (the Syncretistic school), and *Pietism* (Spener, Bengel, Zinzendorf).

Beautiful in his time stands out to our view the historical figure of George Calixtus, Professor for forty-two years in the University of Helmstedt. Amid the tumult of theological controversy and strife raging on all sides, he conceived the idea of finding in the history of the Church a common ground on which all parties might come together in peaceful union; and to this object, then, all his energies were directed and devoted, causing him to be spoken of as the "regent of his time." Having travelled first through Lutheran countries, he made himself acquainted personally also with Catholic lands and different parts of the Reformed Church. He spent a winter in Cologne, "the Trojan horse of the Papacy in Germany;" visited Holland, then in its glory; and from thence passed over to England. On his return, he became settled at Helmstedt, and continued there till his death, in 1656. His studies and travels widened the horizon of his religious views; made him broadly catholic; disposed him to be in all directions irenical, rather than polemical. The miseries of the intolerant Thirty Years' War confirmed him in this habit of mind. He was fond of Jerome's words: "Christ is not so poor as to have a church in Sardinia only, all Christendom is His." He liked to lay stress on what even in Roman Catholicism is Christian, and tried to put aside or blunt the sharp points that separated the Lutherans from the Reformed, and the Roman Church from both, in order that the spirit of true catholicity might plant itself on the ground of the original faith which was still common to them all. So in different works, whose very titles breathe the soul of concord and peace. He was, after J. Gerhard, the greatest theologian of his age; held in high respect, both in Church and State; a man of most imposing, but at the same time attractive, personal appearance. Altogether a name deserving, as few do, the admiring and loving memory of the world. But, alas, his catholicity met with small favor, and only brought him into difficulty on all sides. Still he was not without vast influence in his generation. His followers formed a widely extended and highly respectable school. He led the way particularly in dogmatic history; and his theology, though not strictly of the creative order, told in-

directly, with more or less effect, against the established system. The tendency of it, however, was more intellectual than practical; and showed itself ready to join hands, accordingly, with the reigning orthodoxy against Spenerism.

This third phase of opposition to church orthodoxy represented the will (as Mysticism represented feeling, and Calixtinism the understanding), and carried with it in the end the greatest power. It brings into view the movement of what is known as Pietism. This falls into two periods or stages; the first reaching to the death of Spener, in 1705, in which it appears as a struggling interest, maintaining itself with more or less difficulty against its foes; the second extending from 1705 to about 1730, when it is found to be the victorious and aggressive side. Pietism was the protest of the practical religious spirit against what had become the dead mechanism and formality of the school divinity, the prevailing orthodoxy of the Lutheran Church. It had, of course, large right on its side; but it fell also into large wrong; and, while it served to expose the weakness of the reigning theology at different points, it failed to bring in any stronger system in his place; so that all was made to totter in the end toward a common fall. The fresh life that was in the movement at the first finally died out, and it became itself only a new mode and phase of the one-sided traditionalism it pretended to oppose. Stereotyped phrases and methodical forms came to stand for the proper power of godliness. Experimental or subjective religion resolved itself, in this way, into a scheme of artificial psychological frames and states, which became then the subject of more or less morbid introspection for the minds of those in whom it was supposed to have place; and a sort of anxious outward legalism was substituted everywhere for the free sense of childhood in the family of God.

"Pietism," says Dr. Dorner, "insisted with right on regeneration and experimental religion, and took the first in a more earnest sense than it had for Orthodoxy; which saw in it only the divine communication of ability to believe, nay, held it to be already accomplished in infant baptism. But Pietism made it to be so much a matter of consciousness, as to leave out of view

the objective basis of antecedent grace, on which alone it is possible for the new life to have any sure or prosperous growth, making no account of the unconscious and natural; and by laying all stress on sensible experience, substituted more and more a sickly habit of reflection and self-examination for the exercise of direct, joyous, childlike faith. This painful self-inspection, however, brooding always over the evidences of personal piety (Have I true faith? Have I experienced the new birth? &c.—a disease that broke out in the Reformed Church also at this time), only served to promote a feeling of inward uncertainty, and a vain reaching after notes and marks of grace, that were often only self-made, and anything but evangelical in the proper sense of the term." The system, as it reigned in Halle, degenerated thus into much inward dishonesty and untruth, became narrow and slavish in its views, ran into censoriousness and spiritual pride, and lost altogether the power of producing free, healthy Christian life. It is a most significant fact, that not a few of the leaders of Rationalism proceeded from this school.

Two other vigorous practical movements in the meantime came forward in support of the Pietistic reaction against the reigning orthodoxy; which, although less extensive than the older school, were destined to make themselves felt with deeper and more enduring force, by throwing off its essential faults and appropriating to themselves, in a way it had not done, the elements of a true church life. These movements stand identified with the illustrious names of J. A. Bengel and Count Zinzendorf.

Bengel rose into view as a star of the first magnitude in the theological world, amid the decline of the older Pietism, both in Halle and elsewhere; and soon became the centre of a new school at Würtemberg, the wholesome influence of which has continued to be felt, through all the intervening years of neology and unbelief, down even to our own time. He was distinguished alike for his warm personal piety and his great learning. His position, at the same time, was altogether independent of Halle, and, whatever kindred spirit he had with Spener,

he differed from him materially in what he aimed at and accomplished for the revival of true religion.

Of still different order again was the practical piety of Zinzendorf, and the great Christian family (Brüdergemeinde) of which he became the honored founder. If there was a prophetical significance in Bengel's theology, a divination of much that lay far in advance of his own time, the same must be allowed to hold good also, under a different view, of this new church organization. It was not only a protest, quiet but deep, against the existing state of the Church; it looked beyond it at the same time, and anticipated, as it foreshadowed also, a better order of Christianity in the coming future. The animating soul of the movement was the idea of catholicity, in opposition to all ecclesiastical particularism. No Church, however widely extended, can ignore this idea, without becoming inwardly sectarian and separatistic; and the followers of Zinzendorf, in its faithful representation, fulfilled a high and holy mission for the Church at large, which only the most unchurchly spirit can refuse to honor and admire.

For the theological life of the Protestant Church in general, the spirit of the *Brüdergemeinde* became of vast account first, according to Dorner, through its illustrious pupil Frederick Schleiermacher.

Thus, altogether, it was, that the Lutheran orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, even while it seemed to be strong, by a sort of dialectic process working in its own bosom, prepared the way at last for the general dissolution with which it was overtaken in the following period. The constituents of a sound theology (mystical, intellectual, practical), which the faith of the Reformation had united in itself by a sort of direct genial apprehension, without bringing them still to any clear scientific arrangement and adjustment, gradually fell asunder again—each several factor in succession asserting itself with one-sided force at the expense of the rest; until finally the bond which held them together in the beginning was completely broken, and such a wholesale wreck and confusion ensued, as made it necessary to seek a reconstruction of the entire system under a new and better form.

The catastrophe here referred to was what Dorner calls "the triumph of subjectivity in the eighteenth century." It came close on the heels of the Pietistic controversy, and in a certain sense as its natural result. This seemed to end at first in a sort of general calm, that was supposed to augur well for the interests of religion. Intemperate zeal gave place on both sides to forbearing moderation. "It was," Dr. Dorner tells us, "a comparative bloom-season for Lutheran theology that now came in; and when we consider its leading names, we can hardly help wondering that the Church should have still needed, afterwards, to pass through such sore and terrible trials in the eighteenth century, in order to be restored from the maladies of the time going before. An alliance appeared to have been reached finally between church tradition and zeal for vital godliness, Pietism and orthodoxy, faith and theological science, which promised to be at once prosperous and enduring. But this bloom-season was quickly over; it served simply to usher in the negative criticism, which soon after took entire possession of German theology."

To this season of calm before the coming storm (the Indian summer of the old supernaturalism), belong such names as Gottfried Arnold, Weismann, Pfaff, J. G. Walch, Fabricius, Cyprian, Salig, Buddeus, and Mosheim—men distinguished particularly for their historical studies. Take Mosheim, in particular, as an example of the age: "The accomplished and learned chancellor had a thorough knowledge of English, French, and Italian literature. He wrote against Toland his *Vindiciæ antiquæ Christianorum disciplinæ*, 1720. His other historical works are: *Instit. hist. Eccl.*, 1726; *De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. commentarii*, 1753; and a volume on *Michael Servetus*. He had a rare talent for reproducing dogmatic systems, and wrote also a small doctrinal work of his own, as well as a system of biblical ethics in five quarto volumes, 1735–53. He shows no sympathy with the rigoristic or ascetic views of Halle; inclines, on the contrary, to the eudæmonistic scheme, and a certain philosophical eclecticism put forward in choice, tasteful language, suited to recommend reli-

gion to good society. As an ecclesiastical historian, he moves no longer in the solemn patristic style, or with the tone of a preacher of righteousness; he is the sleek abbē of church historians, with a strong dash of worldliness about him in all his ways. Without any deep sense of religion, he has for the specific life and doctrine of the Church, nay, for the very idea of the Church itself, neither eye nor understanding. It is for him simply a human society, which he is fond of considering (territorialistically), as of one order with the State. He is impartial and faithful to facts; but church history is not in his view a proper life-movement of the Church itself, proceeding from its own principle; it is only a record of the fortunes, which have befallen Christianity from external causes and powers. Movements and changes of doctrine he finds occasioned only by heretics, attacking the Church from outside foreign, especially philosophical standpoints and principles—or, in part, by the necessity, common to all communities, of having fixed laws (here catholic dogmas), for the maintenance of their general life. That the principle of Christianity is itself historical, a force generating evolution and formative movement both in doctrine and life, never entered into his mind. For him also, therefore, Christianity is something more stationary than progressive; all idea of historical movement as concerned with it falls over rather to the side of the powers the Church had to contend with beyond itself, and on these accordingly he bestows his main interest. In one word, Church history, with Mosheim, is a pathology of the Christian Church, more than a record of its actual life."

The fair show that now prevailed, more or less in this spirit, on all sides, was hollow everywhere and sadly delusive. Confidence in the old theological traditions had come to be shattered more than was commonly imagined. The forms of orthodoxy were still honored with decorous outward respect, but their animating spirit was gone; and an ill-concealed sense of weakness betrayed too often the cause it undertook to defend. With a presentiment of what was coming, much was done by the friends of the Church to fortify it outwardly against the

assaults of infidelity. As the Deistic period in England was the age at the same time of Christian Apologetics, which served only, however, to help forward the cause of Deism itself, so now, in Germany also, one of the most significant signs of the growing eclipse of faith, is the way in which pains were taken on every side to prop up the trembling cause of Christianity. The Christian argument became mechanical, and was everywhere a compromise more or less with the skeptical humor it sought to propitiate and convince—an *apology*, of a truth, in the modern, rather than in the old classic sense of the term. It was found necessary to make concessions, to part with old terminology, to qualify what were felt to be extreme positions; but this was done, without reaching any new ground, from which such modifications could be admitted in full harmony with the Christian principle; it was done in such a way as to meet the party to be propitiated on its own premises; and the consequence was, that the new orthodox theology, thus circumstanced, had no power whatever to make any effectual stand against the enemy with which it was called to contend. It was in one boat with the enemy, indeed, without being aware of the fact.

It is a very interesting and suggestive picture, which Dr. Dorner gives us of this rationalistic orthodoxy, on the threshold of the neological revolution of the nineteenth century; a picture well worthy of being held up as a mirror, for the serious contemplation of much that claims to be the best style of Protestant theology, here in America, at the present time.

"This theology," he tells us, "had not properly any new positive principle, to actuate and control its modifications; there was nothing creative in it, no power of production. The robe in which it went about was pleasing; but it was not a theology that touched the root of the evil it was intended to correct. For it did nothing of any account, to bring revelation and the rational nature of man near to each other; to bring into view the need and longing there is in the last for the first; and then, also, the quickening and fructification there is in the first for the second; the friendly relation, in a word, of revela-

tion to reason. As regards *reason*—the Aristotelian and scholastic methods having fallen into discredit as pedantic and lifeless, without any other yet pretending to take their place—it favored a certain loose eclecticism, of no fixed principle or plan, in which all turned on private taste or common popular understanding. *Revelation*, on the other hand, had turned itself for the most part into the very reverse of its own idea; it was made to mean *mystery* (in the sense of non-revelation). Times of unfruitfulness in theological science are always ready to take refuge in the mysteriousness of Christianity, and the abused maxim of "leading captive every thought to the obedience of faith;" not considering that what has absolutely *no* place in the understanding can hold a formal relation only to the authority under which the mind is required to bow, while it implies indifference, in fact, toward the specific reality of the truth itself; so that such faith can no longer be the mother of true, positive, fruitful knowledge, but is a falling back from the Protestant position to the Roman Catholic. For the view in question does not mean simply that the natural reason cannot of itself understand divine things truly, nor yet that the depths of God are unsearchable and past full finding out even for the illuminated Christian reason (which would be strictly evangelical); it amounts to the absence of all desire to penetrate progressively, even in a measure, the wisdom of God's ways. It had contributed not a little to this resigned and indolent view of the mysteriousness of revealed religion, that in certain weighty doctrines (as of Christ's Person, the Trinity, the Atonement, the Holy Supper), the course of theology had involved itself in difficulties, out of which it could extricate itself at best only by the assertion, that the impossibility and inward contradiction of what they taught could not be proved. From the fact of revelation itself, orthodoxy had severed itself by its world of logical conceptions, and lost finally all sense for the living realities of Christianity. We cannot say that this was helped materially by the interest that now began to be taken in historical studies. The historical feeling did not reach yet to the Scriptures themselves; they were looked upon still, as before,

not simply as being the original record of Divine revelation, but as being the very fact of revelation itself; they took its place. Faith in the Bible was made to be Christian faith. Modifications of the theory of inspiration, such as Pfaff proposed, brought here no change. On the contrary, the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit for the Scriptures (contents and form alike) was weakened, by being made to refer only to the instruction and edification which were supposed to be contained in the words of the sacred volume. Exegesis, in the hands of such men as the elder Michaelis or J. C. Wolff, remained as before."

The theology of the time, in this way, was without inward strength. Then there was a growing disaffection abroad toward Christianity and the Church. Men's minds were unsettled on the whole subject of religion. The study of the natural sciences, in particular, became widely prolific of religious questionings and doubts, and gave a materialistic turn to the general thinking of the age. The very air of Europe had become all at once impregnated, as it were, with the spirit of unbelief. "It seemed," says Dorner, "as if the European race, especially in England and France, had now first opened its eyes to nature and her fixed laws, and those who surrendered themselves to this tendency lost more and more all sense for the independent existence and reality of spirit; the idea of God Himself paled more and more before their empirical and sensuous thinking, and they were borne irresistibly toward the materialism and eudæmonism, which were preached by De la Mettrie, von Holbach, d'Alembert, and other encyclopædists. All this, indeed, was still in a measure strange and repugnant to the German mind; it clung to its ideal character, in spite of the growing importation of English and French literature. But already the so-called *Aufklärung* (illumination), found here also its forerunners and heralds, in such men as Thomasius, K. Dippel, and Edelmann, the first of whom especially exerted a far wider influence than any of the theologians."

It was the age of Wolff's philosophy; which, with its dry mechanical method, was any thing but favorable either to earnest

spirituality or to deep religious thought. There was a prejudice against it at first among theologians; but this gave way to a friendly feeling, when it was found capable of being turned to good account, as was supposed, in theological argumentation. Its argumentative power, however, lay wholly in the sphere of the common understanding, and intellectual processes were substituted by it for the living evidence of faith. So toward the middle of the century we have eminent Wolffian supernaturalists (Büttner, Carpov, Reinbeck, Reusch, J. E. Schubert, Baumgarten, and others), who, while laboring to bring about a full union between theology and philosophy in this form, only betrayed in fact the citadel they were called to defend, into the hands of its enemies, by placing themselves on common ground with them in their rationalistic premises. Religion, with this respectable school, was held to be *modus Deum colendi et cognoscendi*, a method of knowing and serving God, a certain amount of theory for the understanding and rule for the will, but without any independent existence of its own. Faith thus was demonstrable like a theorem in mathematics. The witness of the Spirit (Testimonium spiritus s.), lost its old sense, and became now, if spoken of at all, only the testimony of common experience to the salutary influence of Bible truth. Hence the felt necessity of having recourse to outward intellectual proofs for the Divine authority of the Bible and the truth of Christianity; which were sought then, partly under a speculative, and partly under a historical form. Starting from what we know of God, and of the fallen condition of the world, through natural reason, the argument in the first form dwelt on the need of a Divine revelation, on the possibility of it, and on the notes and criteria that must be expected to attend it—one main peculiarity being, of course, the presence in it of mysteries, that is, truths above and beyond all knowledge. With these criteria now the Bible was found to agree; and so the *quod erat demonstrandum* followed: The Bible is the inspired source and principle of all Christian truth. This is palpably unsatisfactory. Reason thus reasoning out of itself the fact of a Divine revelation above itself, is at bottom a contradiction in terms.

Other representatives of the Wolffian school therefore (such as Storr, Süskind, Flatt, &c.), threw themselves on the historical method of proof. Here we meet the chain of evidence, so familiar still to a large part of our American theology, by which what begins as simply human faith in the Scriptures has been supposed to rise logically to the character of Divine faith. First, the authenticity and integrity of the New Testament canon; next, the credibility of the writings; then, the evidence in them (through His miracles and otherwise) of Christ's truthfulness and Divine mission; then farther, the inspiration of His apostles, and so of the New Testament, guarantied by His word; and so, finally, the inspiration of the Old Testament also, established by the witness of the New; the whole process ending thus in what is taken to be an infallible assurance that the Scriptures are the infallible word of God, and so in and of themselves immediately and directly the ground of all revealed truth. All stress was laid in this way on the formal principle of Christianity, with almost no account whatever of the material principle; the simply intellectual argument, on historical and rational grounds, being held sufficient for the full verification of its supernatural character and claims. Reason, it was supposed, could in this way demonstrate the presence of revelation, and settle its credibility, on the outside, as it were, of the fact itself. But who may not see, that Christianity, in such view, must descend into the order of mere natural reason, and lose its strictly supernatural character altogether? The whole standpoint is inwardly rationalistic.

As a matter of course, this way of looking at Christianity made itself felt on all theological doctrines. The Wolffian supernaturalism was essentially Deistic (not properly *Theistic* in the true Christian sense), in its view of God's relations to the world. It had no idea of a Divine immanence in the world, regarded either as a constitution of nature or as a constitution of grace. All was mechanical, external, and hopelessly dualistic. Hence Pelagianizing views of original sin, and of the nature of redemption; of the Church, as a mere voluntary human association; of grace, as an outward assistance simply to the moral

powers of humanity working in its own different sphere. Hence, also, a Nestorian view of Christ's person, of inspiration, and of the atonement; such a sundering of the Divine from the human, as made all to be human finally and nothing more. The old Lutheran Christology was completely given up. The mysteries of Christianity, held in an outward way only, and not as having any thing to do with the proper life of Christianity, grew to be a dead weight which it was found increasingly difficult to carry; and theology, falling in with the reigning spirit of the age, lost all firm hold upon the proper world of faith, and yielded itself more and more to the power of the present world. Thinking everywhere became *popular*, as it was called; that is, mechanical, materialistic, shallow, and flat. All things in heaven and on earth were measured by the scale of utilitarian reference to the wants of the present life. Now come in the so-called popular or practical dogmatic systems (J. P. Miller, 1785; J. J. Griesbach, 1786; Less, 1779; A. J. Niemeyer, 1792; Ammon, 1797), based on the view that Christianity is wholly for practice, and that Christian teaching, therefore, should have nothing to do with what is unpractical and merely speculative; to which category must be referred, then, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Two Natures of Christ, Original Sin, the Atonement, and Justification by Faith. Such was the downward tendency of what still claimed to be the orthodox theology of the age, while it was rushing everywhere, in fact, toward full neological platitude and unbelief.

In this course of things, however, a new movement, not theological in the common sense, but exegetical and historical altogether, and having for its object the determination of what Christian doctrine was in the beginning in distinction from its present form, had come forward with great power, and was now bearing all things its own way toward the most far-reaching, and, at the same time, most unexpected results. At the head of this movement stand Ernesti and J. S. Semler.

Ernesti is the father of the modern grammatical New Testament interpretation. His exegetical manual, translated by the late Professor Stuart, of Andover, has been widely used as a

text-book in our American Theological Seminaries, with little or no sense, apparently, of its dangerous character. It is based throughout, however, on the Rationalistic assumption that the Bible, without any regard to the self-authenticating substance of what it proclaims, is itself the entire fact of revelation, and, as such, capable of being understood and expounded by natural reason, like any other book, without the help of any special illumination whatever. The study of exegesis led naturally to the idea of a biblical theology, in distinction from the ordinary dogmatics.

Ernesti's grammatical interpretation was of itself also historical interpretation; but it is through Semler, more particularly that this method of exegesis and theology comes fully into view, shaking the old order of religious thought at last to its very foundations. Semler was in every way an extraordinary man; all the conflicting forces of his time seemed to meet together in his person; but they were in him without order, a wild, tumultuating chaos, which he had no power to reduce to any harmonious or consistent form. He represents thus the breaking up of his own time, a process needed for the coming in of a better time afterwards, without, however, harbingering at all in any positive way its desirable advent. "It is placing him altogether too high," says Dorner, "when he is spoken of as the father of the later theology in general. Historical criticism forms in this theology but a single factor, nay, nothing more, indeed, than a mere preliminary. He himself came here to no clear, sure principles, or firm results. By bringing the historical element into theology, it is true, he exercised a lasting influence. While the older theology looked upon doctrine as something complete from the beginning, saw in the biblical canon a settled whole beyond all criticism, held the Old Testament to be essentially and directly of one order for the ends of Christian instruction with the New, and had no sense of a revelation moving forward in sacred history from one stage to another; Semler broke the way for a historical view of all these questions, by bringing them up again, and so forcing the uncritical habit of the time to make room for what was here the

more free spirit of the Reformation. Still, taking him altogether, Semler's work was immediately negative far more than positive, a work of destruction far more than a work of creation." With all his historical studies, he had no organ for the right apprehension of history, no sense for its true genetic and teleologic character. It was for him a mere flow, a restless succession of events, in which he saw no abiding substance, no unity in the midst of change, no determination whatever to any fixed end. It had no meaning for him; it served only to destroy all objective landmarks for his faith, and swept him from his traditional moorings out into a sea of general uncertainty and doubt, where he found himself without either compass, rudder, or sail. In all this, however, he was but an image and type, in a certain sense, of the foundering theology of his time.

The general collapse of faith, and the growing triumph of neological illumination (Aufklärerei), came into view now through the portentous appearance of such men as Samuel Reimarus (in the infamous Wolfenbüttel Fragments), Moses Mendelssohn, Nicolai, Gedicke, Teller, Steinbart, Eberhard, and the low-minded Bahrdt. "A deistic atmosphere," says Dorner," seemed to have settled upon that generation, and to have cut it off from all living communion with God. To rest with cold understanding and self-satisfied choice in the present world, without a thought beyond it, was considered to be true wisdom and the soundest exercise of reason. Religion became morality simply, while morality resolved itself into a scheme of prudential eudæmonism, in grosser or finer form. All turned to reflection and reasoning; for originality and ideality there appeared to be no longer any organ whatever." There was a difference, of course, among the theological Neologists; all were not equally virulent and rank. But the general malady was wide and deep, and its power remained unbroken out to the end of the century.

Through this whole time of pretended illumination, however, there were not wanting those who might be said, as voices in the wilderness, to have uttered notes, which were not only a

swan-song for the past, but a lark-song also, hailing the approach of a better future. These stand connected more or less with the birth-struggles of a new and more spiritual literature, that was now forcing itself into view, although not always in forms favorable to Christianity. Dr. Dorner devotes a chapter to the consideration of this formless, embryonic religion and theology, in brief notices of Klopstock, Hamann, Lavater, Jung-Stilling, Claudius, Lessing, and Herder. The last two names, in particular, are of special historical significance and importance; but we can only refer to them now in this general way.

While the bands of authority were thus being broken and cast away in other forms, the way was opened for a general revolution also in philosophy, bringing with it still more fundamental changes, through the earnest and profound studies of Immanuel Kant. All the great questions of the time took new form, and demanded new answer, after the appearance of his critical works on the powers of the human mind. The shallowness of the reigning popular philosophy, as it was called, was exposed and put to shame; room was made for deeper views of the moral nature of man; the problems of religion were thrown into new form. The conflict between Christianity and its enemies was brought to turn on deeper and broader issues than before. Rationalism came to a clearer understanding of itself over against supernaturalism, while the dualistic relation in which they stood to each other forced itself more sharply into view, at the cost of all revealed religion. As there had been an attempt before to unite theology with the Wolffian philosophy, so now it was attempted to bring it into union also, first with the philosophy of Kant, and then with the systems of Fichte and Jacobi; answerable to which, we have still what may be called a change of base and tactics on the side of the enemy, and so new forms of assault and defence on the part of the opposing powers. We have the battle fought, in this way, first on the intellectual, then on the moral, and finally on the æsthetic or sentimental theory of religion. The issue in the third form was determined by the stand-point of Jacobi. Su-

pernaturalism here (represented by such men as Eschenmayer, Vater, Steudel, Emmerich, Heydenreich, &c.) took refuge in the absolutely unknowable character of eternal truth, resolved all religion into inward mystic divination and feeling, and so parted in fact altogether with the idea of any revelation under an outward historical form. This yielded in a short time to the influence of Schleiermacher; but the proper rationalism of this æsthetic stand-point lasted longer, and has its representatives indeed down to the present time. It claimed to be of a higher character altogether than the so-called "vulgar rationalism" of the Wolffian and Kantian order; but had no power, after all, to get beyond a merely humanitarian and natural view of Christianity. To this class fall the respectable names of Ammon, Hase, Rückert, and de Wette; however much the last was drawn personally toward the historical Christ in the latter part of his life, in spite of his hopeless doctrinal dualism.

We thus reach the close of Dorner's second book, in which he brings the separate life of the two Protestant Confessions down to the beginning of the present century; where the historical movement, by its own dialectic process, lands us at last in a general breaking up of the whole organization of the Protestant faith as it stood before; and we find ourselves face to face, as it were, with a sort of universal spiritual chaos, the contemplation of which may well fill the serious mind with amazement and awe; even though it appear spanned at the same time, as our author believes it to be, with the rainbow of hope, and be felt to carry in its struggling womb the *Regeneration of Evangelical Theology*, which forms the theme of his third and last book.

Thus was it altogether, according to Dr. Dorner, that the dominion and power of the old Protestant Orthodoxy, in Lutheran form, fell before the insurrectionary forces of private judgment, private feeling, and private will, arrayed through a long course of years against its towering strength. Wave after wave, the reactionary tide rolled in upon the mighty theological fortress, breaking its buttresses and sapping its foundations, till finally all gave way, and it lay a vast wreck only in the

surrounding waters. Objective authority, in every form, was forced to yield to the imperious demands of subjective freedom; first, the authority of the Church; next, the authority of all outward revelation; then, the authority even of all inward revelation (in the sense of such men as Semler and Lessing), to make room for the absolute autonomy of the human will, as taught by Kant; and, finally, in certain quarters, to cap the climax, the authority of morality and religion altogether, as held to be of objective force in any shape or form. This was the winter solstice, truly, of unbelief, cold and cheerless in the extreme; but, like the season of advent, it heralded at the same time, we are told, the *annus mirabilis* of a new and better faith. "As in severe sickness the body exerts its inmost life-powers to master the disease, so Protestantism, in the great crisis of its subjectivity, from 1750 to 1800, struggled to throw off from itself all that was felt to be a cause of its own want of freedom, whatever lay upon it as an outward or foreign force simply, refusing all assimilation with its inward life while it yet claimed dominion over it. This outward incubus was not the Divine in itself; but the human form that had been joined to it, which caused the historical to appear as unspiritual, yea, the Divine itself as a foreign force, destructive for freedom whether in thought, feeling, or will. For even the supernaturalism of the time, with its deistic character, had as little power to conceive of the concurrence of reason and Christianity, as it had to bring the true idea of humanity into proper union with the true idea of God. Human science had now, however, transcended this false order of thought; and so the old theology went down into the grave. But the *Christian faith* still remained; nay, came even now to new vivification, promising in its time a new theology also; a result, to which philosophy itself, even in its mainly destructive period, furnished material aid. For foreign and even hostile as this was now to Christianity in its general attitude, it wrought under a higher view, nevertheless, in its service as forming an onward process of thought, in which, with all loss, there was still much gain, in the way particularly of what served to foreshadow the inward correlation of the human and

the Divine, and so of nature and grace. The three phases of subjectivity that met us first under positively Christian form, in Protestant Mysticism, Calixtinism, and Spenerism, meet us here again, in like order, under consciously advanced philosophical form; the mystic brooding tendency represented in such thinkers as Klopstock, Hamann, Herder; the intellectual, in the school of Leibnitz and Wolff; the practical, in the systems of Kant and Fichte, the philosophical counterpart of Spener's Pietism, ending as religious feeling in Jacobi instead of Zinzendorf. None of these forms of consciousness, indeed, could stand by itself; each fell short in controversy with the others; still each represented also a true side of the being or idea of man. This whole process now, at the same time, shows close connection with Protestantism, and especially with its inmost law, the material principle of justifying faith. For as this principle offers, or rather requires, self-certainty and freedom holding in God, so the philosophical movement before us (subjective throughout) is based everywhere on the maxim, that whatever is to have power and right over man must be homogeneous and capable of assimilation with his nature, spirit, mind, and will, so as to become for him a personal appropriation and a personal assurance. Even the kindred nature of the human and the Divine breaks into the view of this subjective thinking, where it would itself fain stop in its own position, with what we may call a sort of involuntary surprise. For, while the power of knowing the truth, of willing the good, and of feeling the infinite or Divine, was recognized as not in itself transcending the nature of man, but as belonging to his true being, the two ideas of humanity and Deity were brought together in these several points of conjunction, in opposition to the old notion of their abstract separation; so that it seemed no longer admissible, to conceive of them as mutually exclusive and strange one toward the other. True, the demand for subjective certainty rendered philosophy, in this period, intolerant of all objectivity; but the quick succession of systems in the same line, and their perpetual conflict with one another, allowed no rest; on the contrary, we may say, forced the thinking of the time to reach toward a solution of its difficulties, in some deeper view. Fichte, a remarkable pres-

ence, by pushing the principle of subjectivity to its utmost conceivable extreme, not only shows the necessity of its rebounding into the objective, but through its full analysis brings the principle of objectivity itself also to fundamental philosophical expression. The spirit thus of two epochs appears in him with sharply defined conjunction; one coming after the other, indeed, but in such proximity as to make it plain that only an inward union of the opposing factors could bring their endless, unfruitful conflict to rest, and make room for any further onward movement of philosophical thought."

All this opens before us, as we can easily see, a most interesting field for Christian contemplation. The modern German philosophy, from Kant to Hegel, has not been friendly to Christianity, but for the most part more or less at war with its Divine claims, yet has it been in fact wrestling throughout, in its own sphere, with what is substantially the same question that modern Protestant theology has to do with in the Christian sphere. The philosophical problem is the union of subject and object, of thought and being (Denken und Seyn); transferred to the region of actual religious life, this becomes the theological problem (not solved in the age of the Reformation) of bringing to scientific union the material and formal, in other words the subjective and objective principles of Protestantism—namely, the self-certainty of faith on the one hand (Matt. 16: 16–18), and the infallible authority of the Holy Scriptures on the other hand (2 Tim. 3: 15–17).

PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS.

I. The fact of a progressive falling away of Protestant theology and Christianity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from what they were in the sixteenth century, is not to be denied; and whether we may be willing or not to accept Dr. Dorner's view of it in all particulars, it is certain that it took place under the general character at least, and in the general direction, described in his book. The movement was not confined to one Confession or to any single country; it extended to both Communions, the Lutheran and the Reformed alike,

and made itself felt in all lands. It showed itself in this way to be the result of a common law, and the outworking product of some common cause; whose action must be regarded as starting in the religious life of the Reformation period itself. In other words, the movement must be considered as of a plainly historical character; capable, in such view, of being explained and understood, and challenging the most serious and solemn attention of all who take an interest in the present condition of the Church.

The movement involves two grand stages; two contradictory tendencies, so related that the second begins to work while the first is still in full power; works in the bosom of the first as its own recoiling force, till it becomes finally of overmastering strength, and then sweeps all before it in the way of open revolution and change. The first of the two stages is the period of what Dorner calls *one-sided objectivity* (whether in dogma or ecclesiastical constitution); the second is that of *reactionary subjectivity*, ending in the negation of all positive authority in religion (theoretical free-thinking and practical unchurchliness). The first meets us predominantly in the seventeenth century; the second in the eighteenth.

The seventeenth century, in this view, stands in close connection with the sixteenth, the age of the Reformation, and seems to be at first the simple continuation of its religious and theological life. The great object, all round, was to organize and consolidate the faith that was already enshrined in the Protestant symbolical books. But it is easy to see, that this zeal for the conservation of what was thus handed down as true Protestant Christianity, ran soon into a care for its outward form simply at the expense of its inward life. The faith of the sixteenth century was so intellectualized, as to be shorn of its original native vigor and force. We *feel* that, where we cannot always explain it, in comparing the spiritual life of the older time with the orthodox thinking of the later time. There was a something here in the theology of the sixteenth century, which we find to be wanting in the more elaborate divinity of the seventeenth. So in the Lutheran Church; and so also, full as much, in the Reformed Church.

In the case of the last, the truth of the observation may be verified very readily by a careful comparison of the Heidelberg Catechism, issued in 1563, with the Westminster Catechism brought out in England toward the middle of the century following. Both represent the same faith; but not by any means in the same way. While the orthodoxy of the Westminster formulary is more intellectual, more anxious, more mechanically rigorous and exact, the soundness of the Heidelberg formulary is more emotional, more free, and more full every way of the spirit of actual hearty life. We could hardly have a better exemplification, indeed, of what Dorner makes to be the difference of the two periods in regard to the material principle of Protestantism. In the Heidelberg Catechism, all turns fundamentally on the direct apprehension of the actual substance of the Gospel itself (Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified, as in the Creed), through an exercise of faith which is supposed to be, in such relation to its object, the full verification in itself of what it is thus brought to believe (Qu. 19–23); all this without any reference whatever to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as a starting-point of right belief, although their authority is indirectly recognized everywhere as the necessary formal side of the general Protestant principle. Who may not see, how this squares in full with the original Reformation stand-point both of Luther and Calvin? But what now is the pivot on which all theological certainty is made to hinge and revolve in the Westminster Catechism? Justification by faith is there of course; but no longer as the article of a standing or falling Church in Luther's sense; no longer as the central prop of the whole Christian system, upholding all other doctrines. It is there simply as one among these other doctrines, in the body of the system; which then requires, of course, to be borne up by some other central pillar altogether. This, we are taught at the very outset, is to be found only in the Bible, regarded as the written codex of God's will, "the only *rule* He has given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him"; which rule we are then required to consult, that we may know "what man is to believe concerning God, and what duties God requires of

man." In other words, we have the formal principle of Protestantism here substituted in full for the material principle; and the whole weight of Christianity is thrown upon the canonical authority of the Holy Scriptures, instead of being made to centre on Christ through the direct apprehension of saving and justifying faith.

The theology of the seventeenth century must be considered in this view, universally, a falling away inwardly (though not outwardly), from the original life of the Reformation; which then drew after it, however, by a sort of logical necessity, a far more serious falling away from itself, as well as from the older faith, in the overflowing rationalism of the eighteenth century. Dorner resolves all this into the dissolution of the original unity of the twofold principle of Protestantism, and the wrong that was thus inflicted on the side which represented the inward freedom of the believer, by making all of the side that represented outward authority; a wrong, which then by a righteous nemesis so reacted upon itself, as to end in the overthrow of this authority altogether, and the full unbinding of the principle of subjectivity in all imaginable forms. How far this may bear close examination, we will not now stop to inquire. Enough, that we know the fact, and are able to bring it under consideration in its general historical connections. The eighteenth century, immediately behind us, was an age of what may be called general religious atrophy; an age of feeble, languishing faith; an age, in which sense and natural reason had come to rule everywhere the thinking of the world, while things unseen and eternal were regarded for the most part as visionary abstractions. Not that all theology and religion were dead; the religious spirit wrought mightily in certain quarters against the reigning power of unbelief. But still the power of unbelief *did* reign, on all sides, in fact; and this not only as open free-thinking and infidelity, but as a secret virus also, that served to poison and weaken the very life of faith itself. There was a malaria of rationalism diffused through the whole religious world. The best piety of the age was of a scrofulous habit; while its best theology went wheezing continually toward its own grave.

II. We may be thankful that we come after the eighteenth century. Our own age is bad enough; but it is certainly better in many respects than its predecessor. The movement of religious negation seems to have run its course; so far at least that it has come to stultify itself, and thus call for the building up again of what it has sought to destroy, while the conditions for such reconstruction are at hand as they never have been before. The great problem for the nineteenth century would seem to be the restoration of faith from the disastrous eclipse, under which it has come down to us from the century going before, and along with this the recovery of theology and religion to some answerable tone of vitality and health.

This implies at once, of course, that our mission is not to follow blindly in the wake of the last century, but rather to throw off its authority, and to strike out for ourselves a new course, in which we may hope to avoid all that we see so plainly to have been its calamity and its curse. Some have a foolish way, when it suits their fancy, of lugging in here the respect which is due to our ecclesiastical fathers, as an argument against any the least deviation from their opinions or practices. But what can we think of more outrageously absurd, than to require that the Church of England should be bound in this way now, or the Church of Scotland, by the latitudinarian liberalism of their respective church ancestries during the last century; or that the Church in Germany now should hold on to the rationalistic supernaturalism of the days of Wolff and Kant, out of reverence, forsooth, for the memory of the many excellent theologians who did their best to uphold the cause of Christianity in that poor way? And can it be any less absurd, seriously we ask, that our American Church at the present time, seeking to solve for herself the great religious life questions of the age, should be required to fall back passively upon the *modus Deum colendi et cognoscendi* (the very sound now irksome), which ruled the schools and text-books of European Protestant Christendom some eighty years ago—under pain of being held disrespectful to her English, Scotch, or German *fathers*, whether in the old world or in the new? No; the demand is prepos-

terous in the extreme. Let these fathers be honored as they deserve. Let the memory of their faith, and piety, and zeal, be sacredly cherished by the Church. Still it is not reason, that, representing even the best religious life of the eighteenth century, they should be held most fit to give absolute tone and law now to the proper religious life of the nineteenth century. We are beyond that "age of reason" (God be praised); and if there be any meaning ever in history, it calls upon us now to break away entirely from what is thus in our rear, and to reach forth unto those things which are before, "that we may apprehend that for which also we are apprehended of Christ Jesus."

But yet with all this, if there be any meaning in history, the eighteenth century cannot be ignored, or thrust aside, as of no account for the new life of religion and theology, which is required to meet the wants of the present age. Whether we accept Dorner's view of it or not, in some way it must be taken as a preparation for the subsequent coming in of a period better than itself; and then it must be regarded as having in itself much, that is required to pass over, as positive or negative condition at least, into the constitution of this better period, so as to make it all it needs to be made. Our age, like every other, is the child, in a profound sense, of the age going before it; and it is only through the immediate past, therefore, that we can hold any living connection with the past at large, so as to be historically full and complete in our own generation.

III. The idea of a resuscitated theology then, in our circumstances, requires something more than a simple return to the theology either of the seventeenth or of the sixteenth century. Dorner is unquestionably right in this view. Universally, we may say, such a simple resumption of an old outlived stand-point, without regard to following time, is an impracticable solecism. The past, in such view, is always modified by the time following it, so as to be forever different from what it was in its own time. There can be no such thing, therefore, as what is called the repristination of a past life; and it is only folly to dream of it anywhere, in any shape or form. No man can repristinate for

himself, in this way, his own childhood or youth. He may remember, but he cannot *be* over again, what he has been thus in years that are gone. Just as little can any nation repristinate a former stadium of its national existence, whether in art, science, politics, or social life. And so is it in full, also, with the life of the world as a whole. It moves through stages, which once gone are gone forever, save in the way of spiritual incorporation into the ongoing movement that leaves their forms behind. Can there be ever a literal resurrection of the buried Grecian or Roman civilization? Can the Middle Ages, as sentimental romanticists have dreamed, be rehabilitated for modern times in their old flesh and blood? Never. The law is universal and unchangeably sure. History cannot return upon itself in such style as this. Its general movement is onward, everywhere and always.

Admit then, as we must, such a falling away of Protestant theology, as Dorner's History shows, from what it was in the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries, and it follows at once of itself that the evil is something which cannot be effectually corrected, by any supposed repristination simply of the religious life and habit either of the one period or of the other. The scholasticism of the seventeenth century carried in its bosom the incipient strife of principles, that in due course of time gave birth to the spiritual licentiousness of the eighteenth century; and the possibility of this strife also lay involved in the still undeveloped life of the Reformation period, as something which could be fairly surmounted only by its being brought to work itself into full view, as it did through the theological consciousness of later times. Can all this process now pass for nothing, that we here of the nineteenth century, with such vast historical movement as an accomplished fact behind us, should be able at all (even if it were desirable) to domiciliate ourselves quietly in the precise scheme of thinking that belonged either to the later or to the earlier of these great Protestant periods? To put the question fairly, is to answer it. No unsophisticated mind can have any doubt in so plain a case.

The theological salvation of the present, then, is not to be

found in a slavish mechanical reproduction of the systematic divinity of the seventeenth century (Rivetus, Gomarus, Maresius Cocceius, Witsius, Pareus, Turretin, Pictet, Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calovius, Barrow, Owen, Goodwin, Howe, &c.), whatever of wealth is still to be drawn from the rich mines here offered for lasting use. But neither is it to be found in making no account of this later divinity, and falling back immediately and directly upon the age of the Reformation, as though all truth were there, and there only. For us now, the age of the Reformation is not really accessible or available for right theological use, except *through* the consequent progress of its life in the following period. We cannot put ourselves abruptly back into its precise modes of existence and thought; and if we could do so, it would be for us certainly no enlargement, but a narrowing rather and weakening of all our religious powers. For this reason, that style of Old Lutheranism is not to be admired which affects to be a literal fac-simile in the nineteenth century of what Lutheranism was in the sixteenth century, holding for a nullity the three hundred years that have passed since in the general movement of the world's life. This surely is to seek the living among the dead. The past can have no real life for the present in that way. And just so in the case of our Reformed Church, whose genius it is especially to be large and free, both in her theology and cultus. There can be for us no such thing as a mechanical going back to the thinking of the Reformation period, either in Switzerland, or Germany, or Holland; as though all right thought on every point began then, and became all at once complete then, in such sort as to admit no possible progress through all following time. The very pretence of it is pedantry; which comes, too, with a particularly bad grace from those, who are all the time harping on the free spirit of Protestantism over against the older traditions of the Catholic Church. It is idle, to talk of honoring the Reformation fathers in this way. We never communicate with their actual life at all, by a simply outward echoing of its forms; but only by entering into its inward spirit. And this we can never do effectually, except as it is brought near to us in forms

answerable to the changed conditions of our own time. Indeed, it is something terrible to think of never getting beyond the issues, which divided the Protestant Confessions in the sixteenth century, and entangled their theology in so many thorny questions on all sides. Are we to be forever *banned*, then, to the doom of this great ecclesiastical disruption, without any the least hope of future common understanding or reintegrated faith? Must Lutheran orthodoxy, and Reformed orthodoxy, be considered so rigidly inflexible in their original nature, so utterly unhistorical in their constitution, as to allow no prospect whatever of their even approaching nearer to each other in the course of history; much less, of their ever becoming united in full as one and the same Evangelical Church? But this is just what *repristination* means here, whether on the Lutheran side or on the Reformed side. Let it be *anathema maranatha* then, we say, on both sides. Our Lord is setting before us, surely, a more excellent way.

IV. Through all movement and change, however, Protestantism must remain in harmony, at the same time, with its own original life, and true to its own fundamental principle; and therefore, in any falling away from what it was in the beginning, must have the power of recovering itself again to its first full substance, though not precisely to its first form. This is the necessary argument of its truth; which is to be looked for now, first of all, according to Dr. Dorner, in what he terms the regeneration of evangelical theology, the work to which the Church is called particularly at the present time. Here, of course, all depends on re-apprehending and re-asserting, both theoretically and practically, the *material principle* of the sixteenth century, in a form answerable to the advanced theologi cal conditions of the nineteenth century.

We have seen what this principle was, as it wrought mightily in the first Reformers, against Romanism on one side and Anabaptism on the other. Justification by faith; this so taken, however, as to be an actual laying hold of Christ's atoning righteousness in the person of Christ himself; whereby Christ himself, it was held, became for faith, then, the assuring argu-

ment at once both of his own truth and grace, and also of the believer's interest in the same. In other words, the material principle of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, was so held as to be strictly Christological; the central significance of the atonement was made itself to centre in the life of Him by whom the atonement came, and who of God (as the Heidelberg Catechism, following Paul, puts it), is freely given unto us for complete redemption and righteousness.

But now, taken in this way, the principle of Protestantism falls back simply on what must be considered the original principle of Christianity. It must do so, we see at once, if it is to be received as a true derivation from what Christianity was in the beginning. In the nature of the case, it is true, as the beginning of a new movement in the history of the Church, it was the original Christian principle under one special aspect, supposed to require at the time special, and in some sense, exclusive affirmation. Still, the special principle here could never be valid, except as it was felt to be comprehended in the general principle out of which it flowed; and so it is easy to see how only it can be corrected and brought right, should it be found at any time out of proper course. Any self-rectification of the Protestant principle now, therefore, such as Dorner holds to be necessary for the regeneration of evangelical theology, must be in the way of bringing it to new and deeper radication in the universal Christian principle. So much is abundantly clear; all the Christological tendencies of the age demand it. The doctrine of the atonement, and the article of justification by faith, can be quickened into new life, only through a quickened interest in the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. First the incarnation; then the atonement. That is the everlasting order of the Gospel, and the only true order of all Christian faith.

And yet there are some, who seem to think that the significance of Christ's sufferings and death is imperilled, if the glorious Person of Christ Himself be taken to comprehend in it *more* than this one offering of Himself for sin; that is, if the derivative principle of Protestantism be not so taken as to be

of more profound and broad meaning, than the fontal principle of Christianity itself from which it flows!

Surely, it ought to be self-evident for all, that the Gospel begins in the angelic song: "Unto you is *born* this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." The powers of the Christian redemption meet us first of all in the constitution of the Christian Mediator. Christ is the only principle of Christianity. His mediatorial offices and acts, prophetical, priestly, and kingly, derive all their force from what He is as the Incarnate Word, comprehending in Himself the fulness of the Godhead bodily for *all* the purposes of our salvation.

So it is that all true Protestant faith, fastening itself upon the atonement, must be at the same time true Catholic faith, fastening itself, through the atonement, on Christ Himself, in such way that (whether consciously or not), it shall find in Him more than the atonement; nothing less indeed than the radiant tabernacle of God among men (John i. 14), full of all grace and truth. It must be at bottom of one sense with what Peter and his fellow apostles felt to be in Christ *before* His cross and passion: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the Living God."

And to this, we reiterate, it must come also with all our Protestant theology and church life, if there is to be for them any such new birth as Dr. Dorner holds to be the great ecclesiastical problem of this nineteenth century. It is not enough that they be brought to revert to the standpoint of the sixteenth century, through an inward surmounting of the historical dialectics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; to do this effectually, they must be brought to refer themselves also, through this Reformation standpoint, back to the standpoint of the first Christian ages. There can be no full falling back, in other words, on Luther's principle of justifying faith, that shall not now be a falling back in full also on the original Christological groundwork of the Christian faith as we have it set forth in the Apostles' Creed. It will not do to single out here some particular aspect only of the Mediator's Person, in

the way Dorner and others seem disposed to do, as sufficient for the needs of the case. We must have the Christological principle in full, the whole Person of the Mediator, to start with; as knowing full well, that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and that any theology, therefore, whether Protestant or Catholic, which is not built on this basis, is sure to turn out in the end no better than "wood, hay, and stubble." Let the confessionalism of the sixteenth century be required to root itself in the confessionalism of the second, third and fourth centuries, connecting itself through this old *regula fidei* with St. Peter's great confessional act: THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. This is only taking the Confessions of the sixteenth century, Lutheran and Reformed, at their own word. They own, all of them, the authority of the ancient Christian Creeds. Let earnest be made, then, with this fair and good profession. Let the Apostles' Creed, in particular, be made of fundamental, normative force for all later symbols; so that, however they may be found diverging from one another in what comes after this scheme of sound words, they shall all be found at the same time consenting heartily, here at least, in the consciousness of a common faith. Then the way will be open for a regenerated Protestant theology in the fullest sense of the term. Then confessional polemics may be expected to resolve themselves at once into confessional irenics. Then there will be room for the coming in of real catholic fraternization and union among our different denominational Churches, which even to talk of without this must be considered as only so much chattering nonsense. How can it come to real union anywhere, in theology, worship, or ecclesiastical polity, where there is no agreement, to start with, in the premises of what is to be considered true Christianity, no common acknowledgment of "what be the first principles of the oracles of God"?

Art. II.—INSPIRATION.

BY D. GANS, D.D.

This is the proper place to involve the subject of inspiration. We have already traced, to some extent, the agency of the Holy Ghost in the creation of the world, especially in the creation of form and order, and in the arrangement of the moral laws constituting the moral government of God, which have been made to penetrate and pervade the world, by the power of which, in personal union with the Divine Spirit, it is preserved in order and harmony from day to day.

Still more prominent is this agency in the creation of man, and particularly in the higher and more spiritual parts of his being. While the life of man and the Spirit of God are not to be regarded as the same essentially, as the Pantheist is wont to view them, they dare not, on the other hand, be abstractly sundered, as the Atheist demands. They are, in fact, closely and even vitally related. The life of man is the immediate result of the Divine Breath, and the Divine Breath is the Spirit of God, (Gen. 2: 7.) The highest stage of this life is reached in the form of the human mind. Here it wakes up to self-conscious and personal existence. From this point light goes forth and illuminates every other part of its being, and renders the whole strikingly transparent. All the faculties of the mind, and the relation which they sustain to each other, result directly from the Holy Ghost. The normal order of thought is no more the result of human will or caprice than the order of the world itself. It is in the mind as a necessary law of its own being. Every mind, to act legitimately, is compelled freely to think according to this law, and the conclusions resulting from such thought stand forth as truths which the mind has just as little power wilfully to accept as to reject. True

science carries in it a power greater than our wilful beliefs. Man cannot, without violence to his mental constitution, think ad libitum, but he must think according to the law of his mind; and the same law binds him to the conclusions of his thought. This involves order, and order involves freedom. Power to conceive, compare and conclude, originates in the Divine Breath. Every true action of the mind is a continued breathing on its part under the Spirit of God; and whether it receive, or impart, in either case, it clearly exhibits the agency of the Holy Ghost, under whom it acts.

In this original relation of the Holy Ghost to the mind of man, we find the natural basis of inspiration. The form through which the mind takes up the various material of thought, whether from within or without, and the order according to which it proceeds in the investigation of it — both lie in its own original constitution, secured to it primarily and prominently, by the Holy Spirit. Every ordinary action of the mind, in this view, carries with it in some sense, the idea of inspiration. In great talent, where this original order of the mind is strongly marked, inspiration under this form is more elevated in its character, and accurate in its results. The theory of Mr. Morell, and others, which makes inspiration to consist in an "exalted state of the intuitional faculties," is not wholly in error, however far short it may come in reaching the whole truth. Genius always involves inspiration in whatever department it may be found to move. However reckless and wild it may seem to the ordinary observation of men, it is nevertheless governed by the inward law of its own being, and in its action reveals, as far as it goes, a true and real inspiration. It expresses the mental order of the Spirit under its highest natural form. Its directness of vision is truly astonishing. By one effort, often, it brings up the grandest truths from the deepest depths — truths that have been buried for ages, and in one leap it ascends to the most general principles, exhibiting them in the clearest light, and then leaves them to the fruitless criticisms of the ages. We may thus approximate the idea of divine inspiration from the human side, but we can never in this way fully reach it.

It may be difficult, indeed, to ascertain precisely the degree of accuracy that attached to the original action of the mind as it was formed by the Spirit of God. Yet that it was formed *for* truth, and involved the power, in its natural process of thought, to arrive *at* truth, we cannot well doubt. That in every case it would have done this in an *infallible way*, is, however, not necessarily involved in its normal condition. Limitation belongs to the human mind as such; and limitation precludes the possibility of seeing objects in all their aspects and relations, at the same time. The human mind, by this law of its own being, is confined to single standpoints; and when one aspect of truth is beheld without its relation to other aspects, which are hidden for the time being, it would be both easy and natural so to exaggerate the part which is perceived, as materially to affect the harmony of the whole and thus involve the power of error and falsehood.

In addition to this, the will, though it also received from the Holy Spirit the law of its action, was nevertheless left free, that is, was left with the power, either to move in harmony with its original order, or to forsake this and select another law of motive and action. The necessity of this freedom lay in the nature of the will itself; and with this freedom of will, it is easy to perceive what a great disturbing power there might be over the ordinary natural processes of the mind, endangering the accuracy both of premises, processes and conclusions. That the will, in its original constitution, actually did possess the power to choose another course from that suggested by the law of its own proper being, is now experimentally evident by the presence of sin, which could only result from a will possessed of freedom, and involving the idea of personal responsibility. With the disturbing power of sin, which has thus become actual and universal in the race, reacting upon the freedom of the will, which is itself a power more or less disturbing the mind fails entirely, now, to inspire confidence in the infallible accuracy of its conclusions. The original order secured to it by the Holy Spirit has been confused; the spiritual light which shone through it, originally, illuminating its action and inspir-

ing its results, has been greatly dimmed; and moral darkness has actually taken its place. The mind, led by a corrupt will, has become prone to error, and not only prone to error, but has actually passed measureably into moral chaos, from which it can only be delivered by the moving of the Divine Spirit over it in some way analogous to His moving over the natural world.

There are two conclusions which necessarily result from this state of facts. The first we may express in this form: If, in the normal state of the mind, the inspiration, which resulted from its natural relation to the Holy Ghost, was not necessarily of such a character as to give infallible accuracy to all its conceptions of truth, much less can we hope that such infallibility will attach to any results in its abnormal state. If the necessity for something higher than the mere natural inspiration growing out of the order of the mind formed by the Holy Ghost, lay in the original constitution of the mind itself, then this same necessity, now that sin has confused this order, weakened the mental and moral faculties, and rendered the whole intellectual being of man carnal and chaotic, is much greater and more absolute.

The second conclusion is, that, while the full idea of Divine Inspiration, in addition to the natural, demands also a supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit, this supernatural agency is not unnatural. The way has already been prepared for it in the original forming of the mind. The mind craves it as a completing of its primary nature and endowment — not indeed the actual principle of inspiration as a supernatural investiture in every individual case, but the legitimate effects of this principle are demanded by the original formation of each mind, to satisfy its own nature, as well as to secure the high and true end without, to which it is related. Here lies the inherent demand for a Divine Revelation. The meeting of the supernatural with the natural, the vital union of which, in the mind of man under an extraordinary form constitutes the state of inspiration, is not to be regarded as involving, in any way, a violence, either to the law of the mind itself or to that of the Spirit of God. It is only a completing, under a supernatural form, by the Holy Spirit, what had been begun by the same

Divine agency, in the natural creation. In both aspects of the subject—the natural and the supernatural—the Holy Ghost is the immediate and only source. As it was the Spirit of God who gave form and order to the mind of man and constituted, through this form and order, the source of his natural inspiration, so now, it is the same Spirit who, seizing hold of the natural, lifts it up into an extraordinary state. This two-fold view of the subject thus naturally forced upon our reflection, will enable us to see more clearly the propriety of a distinction between the Divine and Human elements in inspiration, which will meet us farther on in our subject.

At the present point, it is important to distinguish properly between Revelation and Inspiration. These two things are often confounded; and the result is confusion to both subjects. They are not related in the way of degree, as some suppose, the one being an advanced stage of the other. Their difference is specific. They are different both in their material, source and end. Revelation, as to its material aspect, is a direct divine communication both of such truth which the human mind could not attain to because of its lying beyond the boundary of the human reason, and of such as lay within this boundary, but which, on account of some cause, it has not, and would not have appropriated. Of the former kind are all those facts in the future predicted by the prophet, and all the peculiar hidden laws of Christianity; of the second kind of truth are all those historical facts which have been made to enter into the body of revelation, both in the Old and New Testaments, and to carry with them, on this account, divine authority. Revelation, in both these aspects, is truth directly communicated from a divine source. Inspiration, on the other hand, is the supernatural actuation of the Holy Ghost, by which the human mind is qualified to receive this revelation in its strict integrity, and then to communicate it, as such, either in an oral or written form, in such a way as to stamp it with absolute infallibility. Revelation may be regarded, therefore, as the divine material, of which inspiration is the proper and infallible form or expression.

Their respective sources illustrate the same difference. The Son, the second Person in the Holy Trinity, is the source of all Revelation, while the Holy Ghost, the third Person, is the source of all Inspiration. In all the revelations communicated to men during the period of the Old Dispensation, by whatever messengers or instrumentalities they may have been mediated, the Eternal Son stands forth as their source. This office attaches to Him by His peculiar nature and relation in the Trinity. He is the Logos—the Eternal Word of the Father, and as such, the Revealer of the Father's mind. "No man hath seen God at any time," &c. Besides, He stands between the Father and the Spirit, as the Divine Centre of both, receiving into His Person the hidden meaning of both, and then He comes forth, and under the form of the Word, discloses their natures. In the incarnation of the Son all revelation culminated. In this act, the source of all revelation was brought into actual contact and union with our nature itself in the only form in which it could be properly appreciated and understood. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us." He was the light that lighteth every one that cometh into the world. He himself was the revelation; and hence He said: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

In the same emphatic way do we find the Holy Spirit set forth as the source of inspiration. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The peculiar nature of the Spirit no less clearly indicates His office as the Inspirer. He is the Divine Breath—not the Word; and He is compared to the wind, "which bloweth where it listeth"—inflating the mind—penetrating and elevating the soul, and thus qualifying it to apprehend the revelation in and from Christ, and to give it forth in a way at once clear and unerring. And then He proceeds from the Father and the Son, that, upon the whole circle of material revealed truth, He might impress the stamp of infallible accuracy. "This agency of the Holy Spirit, by the very force of the term, forms the essence of the idea of inspiration; and the two Conceptions thus pointed out, of the Eternal Word as the Divine Person who reveals, and of the Holy

Spirit as the Divine Person who inspires, are the pillars upon which must rest any theory respecting the Bible and its origin which can deserve serious notice."

The same specific difference is seen also in the respective ends contemplated by revelation and inspiration. The end of revelation is to impart Divine substantive truth to the mind, and the end of inspiration is to give power to perceive this truth as such, and to record or declare it, as such, without any possibility of error. Such is the real difference between the two, that the one may be entirely absent while the other is actually in the mind. Thus, there is no doubt at all on the part of any, that the Patriarchs possessed an actual revelation, but the fact that none is recorded by them is evidence that they did not possess the qualification for this work arising from inspiration. Others, it is equally clear, were actually inspired men, as for instance the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, to whom no specific revelation was communicated. This, it may be supposed, was more rarely the case, as inspiration is the objective gift, and implies a public commission.

Revelation, without inspiration, is frequently communicated, but the object, in such cases, is personal, not general. So, too, spiritual illumination is also imparted, that, connecting with the revelation, and penetrating it, the individual end may be more certainly and effectually accomplished. These are both purely subjective gifts, which look, not to the setting forth of a revelation officially for others, but to personal improvement, or to the discharge properly of peculiar individual functions. In this ordinary way each Christian is no doubt frequently the recipient of gracious communications from the divine mind. Sometimes the revelations are so rich, and the rays of spiritual light so brilliant, that the subject becomes almost overwhelmed by them. Many have been led, in view of them, to fancy themselves called to the office of the Prophet; and have actually given forth utterances, under the serious impression that these were the pure words of God for the world. But the best of these need only be collected and then compared with those in the Bible, to prove their spurious character. The reason

is, that, though the revelation and the illumination are both true, and actually from Christ and the Spirit, they were designed only for individual purposes, and that the supernatural gift of inspiration proper was lacking, whereby alone the subjective revelation could be brought up and set forth in an objective and unerring form for others.

Though these two forms of Divine gift are thus specifically different in their nature, source and end, yet for the purposes of an objective revelation, they are nevertheless closely related, as form and contents. The necessity for this relation is at hand in the subjective consciousness of the individual who has been selected as the medium through whom the revelation is to receive an objective and infallible form. Without inspiration, how shall the individual know that the truth which has come into his possession, is an actual revelation from God? How shall he distinguish it from his own thoughts? and how shall he give it an infallible record? And without an actual revelation, what would be the practical utility of inspiration? In the production of the Word of God both are united.

Inspiration is purely objective. It does not look to the individual as such, but to the general. It involves a mission on behalf of others. Through it the mind becomes capable of penetrating its own subjective consciousness, of discriminating clearly between human and divine thoughts, of seizing hold upon the divine revelation, of holding it firmly in all its integrity, and, finally, of communicating it to others, or of giving it an objective form also for the world, free from all error, stamped with infallibility, and bearing in every word the authority of God.

But how does Revelation come to us?

We here meet the two elements—the Divine and Human—which enter into the subject, intimation of which has already been given. That the idea of inspiration demands the pressence of these two elements, none can doubt who will reflect seriously upon its nature. That God gave a Revelation is a simple fact that meets us on all sides and constrains our faith; and that this Revelation was given through the agency of the

human mind and human words, is a fact equally clear and self-evident. Here, then, are the two elements which plainly enter into the idea now under consideration. To deny this is to deny simple facts; and to ignore the active agency of the one, by any theory that may be devised, is to ignore in the same way also the agency of the other; for as both enter into the idea itself, and aid in completing the essence of the idea, we can clearly have no proper conception either of revelation or inspiration but as we recognize the presence and activity of both elements. Take away the Divine Element, and at once every possibility of a revelation is also taken away; but admit this, and deny that human instrumentality is involved in it, and what means are left by which the Divine agency shall bring it into an objective form as a revelation *for man?*

How are these two elements related in the production of the Bible? Upon the answer we give to this question will depend our more definite view of inspiration. At this point all theories of inspiration take their rise. There are various degrees in which the one may be regarded as preponderating over the other, and each degree will give a peculiar shade to the theory. As it is not our design to enter into the minutiæ of the subject, we shall confine ourselves to the two leading systems which have resulted from the undue preponderance, first of the Divine element over the human, and second, of the human element over the Divine.

The system of inspiration resulting from the first extreme, is the *Mechanical.* In this system, the preponderance of the Divine may be of such a nature, or regarded as holding to such an extent, as actually to ignore the human altogether, or, if not this, then to bind it, destroy its freedom, and render it wholly passive. Revelation, according to this view, takes its character wholly from the Divine mind. It admits of no degrees. It is stiff and unbending—has no power to accommodate itself to human capacity. It allows of no difference arising from truth which lies beyond the power of reason to apprehend, and the natural facts of history which lie open to the human mind, and which, by its own effort, it might seize and

understand. Every part of revelation moves on the same plane. It is all from the Divine mind, and from the Divine mind in the same way. The whole structure has an unvarying fixture. Even the order of the several parts, the form of the sentences and the precise words—all is directly from God, in such a way as to admit of no other agency whose free activity might in the least degree modify it.

Inspiration, according to this view, consists in the extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit exerted in such a way as to bind all the individual faculties of the person through whom the revelation is made. Human freedom is entirely suspended. Human consciousness, for the time being, is destroyed. The individual has neither thought nor volition of his own. All his personal peculiarities are deadened. His mind is wholly passive, or, if it act at all, the power that produces the action, as in the case of a machine, is from without, and not from within; and in this state, God is regarded as speaking through him, and thus projecting an objective and infallible system of revelation. When God's purpose with the individual is subserved in this way, he is permitted again, like a bent bow, to resume his natural state, all unconscious of the divine streams of truth and light which have flowed through him to the world.

That this view of the general subject is radically defective, all must readily see. The design which underlies this system of inspiration, and from which it springs, is pure and laudable; it is to secure to the revelation of God, in the most perfect way, the highest degree of infallible accuracy. Of course the revelation, under these circumstances, if this were possible, would be *Divine*. But this result demands, surely, no such extreme device. Granting that a Divine revelation might be made to the world under such conditions, we can very easily perceive that it could and would not be adapted to man. That moral product which, because of its peculiar nature, the active, conscious faculties of the mind could have no agency in forming, would be just as far removed from their power to appreciate and understand. The human element being entirely excluded, it could waken no echo in the human breast. It might, indeed, be

perfect, but the perfection would be like that of the Divine Being itself—incommunicable. Man would doubtless be amazed at it, but he could never see his own image reflected from it; he could never enter it and find there the true element of his own life; he could never incorporate it into his own being, and make it the law of his own mind. Such a revelation could admit, indeed, of none, either of the practical or theoretical purposes which a revelation, to man in the nature of the case, is designed to serve.

Every such view of inspiration is unnatural. It destroys the relation between the agency of the Spirit in the natural formation of the mind, and the same agency in the completing of this formation, by connecting it with divine knowledge. By the Spirit of God the mind of man was qualified for an active agency in divine communications; but by this theory the destruction of its activity is made the first and necessary condition on which these communications are made to it. The mind does not reach its ultimate end through a higher development of its normal state, under supernatural influences and gifts, but through a destruction of this state. It involves a radical antagonism between the natural and the supernatural, which would always prevent their real and free union. It does violence, moreover, to man's nature, by making him to be, for the time being, what he is not in fact, and according to the normal laws of his constitution. Besides, the theory furnishes no reason why anything else, as well as the human mind, should not be selected as the medium of revelation. The Holy Ghost, in this form of inspiration, is made to ignore and contradict the result of His own formative power in the natural creation. Such a deadening of our being is manifestly not an inspiring of it. Inspiration is the inbreathing of life, by which the natural faculties are more highly elevated and made more intensively active—not the inbreathing of death, by which they are depressed or destroyed.

The peculiar manner of God's operations in other respects proves the erroneous character of this mechanical view of inspiration. God everywhere works through the instrumentality

of man. In choosing men for the accomplishment of any given purpose, He does not proceed arbitrarily, but has, as it will be found on examination, minute regard to the natural fitness of the men for the end to be attained. This natural fitness is a ground of the choice. Instances of this fact might be given without end, but we cannot tarry with detail: and after the men are thus selected, God uses the natural faculties of which they are possessed, and in this way accomplishes His spiritual purposes. But the theory of inspiration which makes it necessary for God, in order to project a revelation, first to destroy or set aside the natural faculties which He has created, breaks with this whole analogy of Divine operations; and induces, moreover, an actual contradiction into these operations. A system that finds itself compelled to do this, can, clearly, have no just claim to the merit of securing to revelation the highest degree of consistency, adaptation and infallible accuracy; for, if it necessitates a contradiction in the operations of God, through which a revelation is projected, what reason can it give its friends that God will not also contradict Himself in that revelation itself?

But how can we believe any such mechanical system of Inspiration to be true, when in the Bible itself we see such marked individual peculiarities? No one can intelligently read ten sentences in any part of it without discovering all the idiosyncracies of their respective authors. This is true in the Old as well as the New Testament. The inspired penmen wrote according to their peculiar nature. Pass carefully through all the books and you will not find any two written in the same style. The peculiar normal and cultivated tendency of each writer is clearly expressed. The human element, under its normally free form, is patent in every page. How can we account for facts like these on the ground of a system that denies to the respective authors of the Bible all individual action and freedom? View this theory from what ever quarter you may choose, and such will be the number of difficulties which will crowd upon your vision, that you cannot, even if you strongly desired, believe it to be true.

The other system is called the *Dynamical* system. Here the human element may be made unduly to preponderate over the Divine. The theories arising from this source are numerous, each marked by the degree of preponderance on the part of the human over the Divine element, the moral worth of revelation diminishing as the human factor in its production unduly increases. In some the human is so prominent that the Divine is entirely ignored, and men left wholly to the unaided activity of their own minds in the production of the Bible. This was the view taken by the infidel Strauss, and others, who maintained that the Scriptures are a collection only of pre-historical myths. Socinians stand very much upon the same ground. They allow indeed that the sacred writers were honest men, and competent witnesses of what they saw and heard, but still fallible, and, like other men, prone to error. Some confine the attribute of infallibility to Christ, and regard the apostles as highly competent though fallible reporters. Others admit the Divine into closer union with the human mind in the origin of the Bible, whose views are still far short of the truth. The Quakers regard the inspiration of the authors of the Scriptures as consisting only in a preëminent degree of that spiritual illumination, which, in a less degree, is common to all Christians. In this sense the whole conception of inspiration is subjective, and wholly so. Others, who hold still less prominently the human element, admit that inspiration renders the sacred penmen infallible in all truth that is specifically of a spiritual or religious and supernatural character, but that in regard to all historical facts, natural phenomena, and scientific laws and deductions, which have been incorporated in the Bible, they, as well as others, are liable to error. This leaves a large portion of Bible fact uninspired. Sad work is often made, on this principle, of the five books of Moses especially. In the system of Schleiermacher, who is substantially represented by Mr. Morrell, the equitable blending of the two elements is still more nearly reached. Inspiration is still regarded, however, as a thing of altogether minor importance, as compared with the general and vivid representations of the devotion and

sacrifice of Christ, and of the intense religious life of his immediate followers which the New Testament gives. For them it consists, as already stated, in a general elevation by the Holy Spirit, of the intuitional powers, which finds its analogy in the genius of the unaided mind. Thus error, in regard to this subject, increases just as these two elements are removed from each other, or just as the one is regarded as preponderating unduly over the other. Both these systems are false, and both, in some sense, are true. The error lies in the improper relation of the two leading elements,—the truth in their proper union or relation. What is the true relation?

We may not be able fully to penetrate this union, or to understand minutely the inward and mutual operation of the two factors in the production of the sacred Scriptures; but from the nature of each, connected with the general result, we need not be ignorant of at least some of the more general and necessary conditions. That the union involves activity on both sides is clear from the nature of the case; and that this activity is in perfect keeping with the laws peculiar both to the Spirit of God and the minds of the sacred writers, so that no violence is done to either, must also be so manifest as to constrain the belief of all. The supernatural, though it really enter the natural, neither destroys nor enslaves it. In the elevation of the human mind, and its union with the Spirit of God, in inspiration, there is more implied than the mere excitation of intuition. An extraordinary and new spirit-principle is given to it, which, however, instead of paralyzing its ordinary powers, only brings them into more intense activity. The mental action of the sacred writers was not suspended, but rather "sustained and made fertile by the Divine Spirit, with a view to the preparation of the Scriptures, in a two-fold manner. Either, all that lay beyond the limits of human experience and human knowledge was imprinted by the Spirit in their minds, in prophetic contemplation, or, in those cases in which events lay within the bounds of human knowledge, their natural ability to distinguish error and truth, was in so far exalted and sanctified, that they were enabled to ascertain and comprehend the truth in its

purest form."—Kurtz's Sacred History, p. 28. In this extraordinary state of the mind, it is made not only to open itself freely to the revelation which is made to it, and to receive it, and in some true sense to reproduce and make it its own, but also to give it forth in human words precisely expressive of every shade essential to its complete integrity as in itself considered. We do not say that the words in which the mind, in this state, embodies its divine thought, are mechanically dictated by the Spirit, but that the ordinary relation which holds between a clear, full thought and its appropriate word or words (which relation was fixed by the Holy Spirit in the Natural Creation, and which, for ordinary purposes makes the outward word to be a true and commensurate exponent of the inward thought or feeling), is raised into this extraordinary state, and so connected both with the subject-matter of the revelation and the terms adapted to its expression that it can neither be mistaken in regard to the one or the other, and that it will, by the force of this new divine principle, freely and necessarily, give an infallible form to the thought it embodies. Yet the words will take their character at the same time freely from the peculiarities of the individual who is made the bearer of the divine message, just as the message itself is made primarily to correspond with the same peculiarities. They would not be the precise words which another in the same state, but with different idocyncrasies, would select, and for the reason that the revelation itself would not be precisely the same that another would have. But, though the words of each be different, those used by one are just as infallibly expressive of the sense of the message communicated to him, as those of another are of the message given to him. The message itself will depend upon the natural peculiarity of the individual, and the words will depend upon the peculiarity of the message. Hence the diversity. It can easily be perceived, indeed, that this diversity in the way of expression on the part of different sacred writers, is one of the strongest evidences that each is infallibly true. Allowing the free activity of individual peculiarities, and the fact that God, when He called different per-

sons to be the bearers of His revelation, had regard to their respective peculiarities, and gave to each the message adapted to these, it would be quite evident, that if they all used the same words, they would not and could not express fully the peculiar truth assigned to each. But if each speaks his own language under the Spirit of God, corresponding with his own peculiar nature, however different his words may be from those of another in regard to the same general subject, the effect can only be the enlargement of the general circle of revelation, bearing in its own nature convincing evidence of infallible accuracy.

This is the origin of the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testaments. Though all their parts may not be revelations in the same high sense—for many portions are composed of natural facts and principles which the minds of the sacred writers might, and oftentimes doubtless did know of themselves—still, as they have been recorded under the inspiration of the Spirit, they are, equally with other portions, the Word of God. It is inspiration that gives them their value in the Bible. These natural facts, thus located by the Holy Ghost, do not speak from earth, but from heaven. They have a new, higher and holier mission; and connecting with the natural incidents of Christ's miracles and parables, they point to Him to whom it is the design of all revelation and inspiration alike, to lead the soul. Thus, upon every part of the Bible—upon every subject, upon every style of composition—aye, and upon every word, God has impressed the seal of Divine infallibility.

Art. III.—THE MINISTER A PUBLIC MAN.

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, A. M., GREENCASTLE, PA.

History is the gradual revelation of the divine will, with reference to humanity, in the form of life. It is the unfolding of the original idea of creation through the thoughts and feelings and actions of men. It takes in the whole domain of our human life, from the beginning to the end of time; and gathers together, in one plan and purpose, all of experience and activity which heretofore has, or ever will be, realized by our race. Its living idea is the grand controlling force and moulding power which energizes the onward movement of the whole world, ever fashioning its destiny, and shaping the means to their appointed end. It recognizes in man a self-determining agency, and through his intelligence and will works out its ultimate purpose. In this moral agency, this power to consent to, or resist the force of the divine idea, do we find the cause of those abnormal vicissitudes, and unlawful demonstrations, which confront us upon the arena of history. Had not sin entered into the world, these bitter results would have had no existence. Then would the stream of history have been unruffled. The human will, being in full harmony and accord with the divine, it would have moved peacefully onward, realizing to man, at every stage of progress, the full force of his controlling idea and destiny, and filling him with the blessedness for which he was created. But sin having entered into the world, it has arrayed him in an attitude of antagonism to the divine plan, impelling him, continually, to escape from its embrace, and to disrupt the whole order of creation. This rebellion hurled him against the thick bosses of God's all-concluding and pervading idea, and placed him in a hostile attitude against his fellow man. Hence the conflict and

strife, the misery and bloodshed which mark his track, on the page of history.

But, with all his self-will and opposition, he is left without the power to escape from the force of that purpose and plan, which conditions all his outward relations, and permeates his very being. He may, indeed, array himself against it, but only in some way to subserve its advancement, while he, in turn, falls crushed beneath the wheels of its resistless progress. All men stand in the bosom of this divine idea, carrying in itself the force of life. And he can be man, in the proper sense of the term, and realize the purpose of his creation, only as he allows himself to be controlled by its power, and directed by its guidance.

We are not, then, to regard the human family as a great multitude of units, the interests and destiny of each one of which are rounded off and concluded within the confines of his own individuality. But rather as one grand organic whole; permeated by a common life, comprehended in the same creative plan, and appointed to the same mission, namely: to minister to the consummation of that plan.

To him who has ears to hear, do the undertones of consciousness reveal this fact. Indeed, we can scarcely conceive of a man so deeply besotted in sin as to be altogether insensible to it. There still will be voices sounding from the depths of even a wrecked nature, that will tell of lost harmonies; that will speak of relations and purposes and designs which are not comprehended in his individual person; and life has been a failure to him, because he sought to save it upon the treacherous shoals of selfishness, while he might so surely have saved it by committing himself to the purpose of that God,

> "Who plants his footsteps in the sea,
> And rides upon the storm."

We all feel that we are included in an economy more comprehensive than ourselves. That there are wants stirring within us that tell of outward relations which we may not ignore. Life is more than meat and drink. The sense of kindred and rela-

tionship lies far deeper than any considerations of mere self. It indeed underlies its true idea. All right feeling must recognize the family to be a vital constitution, in the bosom of which the individual finds his proper meaning and happiness. It involves interests which attach themselves to the very centre of his consciousness, and, reaching out beyond his individual person, conclude him in relations which condition all his activities. We feel that we have personal individual wants and interests, but these are subordinate to the more general and equally vital concerns of the family. The former are included in the latter, and are dependent upon them for their rightful satisfaction. This is true of each member of the family. Hence it is that these common interests gather themselves together in the Father, as the head and governing power of the organism. Each member fills out the measure of his individual activity, but still in strict subordination to the head as the conservator of the general interest, in which all equally stand.

The same principle holds good with reference to the more comprehensive constitution of the State. In a certain sense, the citizen feels himself to be an individual interest. He distinguishes between self and the multitude of fellow citizens around him. In this capacity does he exercise himself in his avocation, and his immediate incentive is the well-being of self and of the family. And it is not unfrequently the case that, in the pursuit of his private interests, he seems to regard self as the final motive, and for a time forgets the relation he sustains to society and the general well-being. But there is, notwithstanding, a consciousness of relations, which reaches out beyond himself, and comprehends the whole order of society in which he stands. Life for him is made up in great measure of the movements of society. He feels himself to be so linked to his fellow men, that his sympathies and feelings are ever going out towards them. An event which affects his neighbor, touches the springs of thought and feeling in him. And if that event affects the community at large, he instantly recognizes his relation to the general body, and feels that the event in its effects reaches his individual person. In the affairs of govern-

ment, he feels that he has a vital interest. And however narrow or sordid may be his selfishness, he may not divest himself of the consciousness that he is comprehended in it as the power of a general life, and that its fortunes, whether for weal or woe, are his own. Hence the controlling power it exerts over him, and his ready response to its claims, even to the most painful sacrifice of self, and even, if needs be, of life itself. He feels that it is an interest deeper, stronger, and more important than his individual life, and surrenders himself accordingly to it.

Now the citizen may fail to discern the *significance* and *design* of this general interest, as the power of history and the force of the divine will, shaping and controlling the destinies of men. He may fail to do so, as he contemplates it in the fullest light of intelligence possible to the natural mind, as embodied in the highest forms of government, or as the savage, as he sees it in his rude, tribal form; yet in either case, will he ever have the consciousness of standing in the bosom of a constitution, which, while it equally comprehends all his fellows, conditions and shapes all his private relations, makes him what he is, and beckons on his hopes for the future. All feel, accordingly, that these general public affairs are of the very first importance, and call for the most jealous care and deference. And those to whose special oversight and management these interests are committed, are looked upon as conservators and guardians of the public weal.

Thus we see that, starting with the consciousness of the individual, we are conducted to the necessity of a class in the State, who may be denominated public men. And this, too, even though we should regard the state as a mere human institution, and its powers as but the concession of the individual from prudential considerations. In *this* view of the case even, public men or officers of government stand clothed with an importance which challenges and commands the respect and homage of the private citizen. But, when we consider the State as a divine institution, and its powers and aims as being comprehended in God's purpose and plan, and the workings of the machinery of government as the development of this plan, we can understand

why it is that these public interests reach so far down into the consciousness of the individual, and command so effectually his obedience and self-surrendry; why it is, that he sees in the public man a power to which he does homage, and looks up to him as his guide and protector.

But the State comprehends not the whole range of history, and the full idea of the divine plan. It stands in the sphere of the natural, and, while it may subserve the temporal interests and growth of the individual, it has no power to meet the wants of his spiritual nature, and satisfy that deeper consciousness which is the main-spring and primary force of his being. Aside from this deeper religious nature of man, the State would be powerless to minister truly to even his temporal well-being; for its ability to influence him in the way of motive, would reach no deeper than self-interest. He would obey its behests, and surrender himself to its control only from prudential considerations; and to what extent these have power to withstand the overwhelming flood of sin, and the powers of darkness, we all are but too well informed by personal experience and the broader page of history. Humanity as a whole, as well as every department of its life, would fall the helpless victims of these disintegrating forces, and all would be thrown into anarchy and confusion before them, but for the religious element which the fall did not totally destroy, and which makes the redemption of man possible. The State needs the principle of authority as answered to by a sense of moral obligation, which is vastly more powerful than worldly prudence or self-interest. This principle holds in a consciousness of higher, deeper, and more comprehensive relations than pertain to our natural estate. It is that voice in man that tells of spiritual and eternal relations —of relations that gather in and conclude all nations and all races, all times and all ages—of relations that transcend all the limits of time and space, that, reaching back to their origin in the creative mind of God, stretch anxiously yet hopefully forward to the grand consummation of the divine plan in the heavenly world. It is this consciousness in the individual, that clothes the state with authority, and enables it to work out its

mission. But still its mission is but partial, and it can never meet and fully satisfy this consciousness. Man feels that he has wants and interest that reach far beyond. These hold in the all-comprehensive organic idea or purpose of the divine mind.

The revelation of this purpose we have in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here we have the gathering together of all things, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, in one. Here do we find the solution of the whole mystery of creation, the answer to the ever-protesting consciousness of humanity, and the satisfaction of its every want. Here is it brought into its right relations to the whole order of creation and to the being of God, as the centre and ground of its life. In this fact, then, does humanity behold its last and ultimate good, and only now, as the individual comes to be taken up and comprehended in this fact, can he attain the true idea of his being, and find rest for his consciousness.

This great fact holds now for the world, in the Church, the Body of Christ, as the force of a general life. Christ is head over *all things* unto the Church. Herein is comprehended the last meaning and purpose of the whole order of the world's history for all time. And it is possible for man, and all institutions; for all departments and legitimate movements whatsoever, of our human life, to realize their purpose and design, only as they come to be comprehended in, and permeated by the life of the Church. The State, therefore, is not an ultimate end in itself. It is but a means to an end beyond itself. Its officers and public men are entitled to all proper respect and reverence, as ministers in one of the departments of the outworkings of the great plan in which it is comprehended. But they can be true to their position, and entitled to their full measure of respect, only as they take knowledge of the more comprehensive interest in which the nation is included, and bring all their resources to bear for its promotion.

It remains, therefore, for the Minister, the ambassador of Christ, the officer in that supernatural constitution, in which is revealed God's ultimate purpose, to stand forth as the conserva-

tor of the highest interests and dearest relations of the children of men. How important soever others may be, however necessary to their individual prosperity and social well-being, all are doomed to final failure and disappointment, only as they are conditioned and controlled by them. All earthly joys and hopes, all peace, all rest, after which the soul ever longs and strives, must end at last in the blackness of eternal despair, only as they are raised above the ruin of death, under the power of which by nature they lie, and, included in that order of grace which stands superior to death, are enlivened by the light of eternal life.

Man's religious nature, ever uttering its protest against the wrong of sin, ever revealing itself in some form or other, even in the darkest night of ignorance and barbarism, attests his conscious sense of a relationship to God, as his highest, greatest, all-concluding good. Hence the priest, the officer of his religion has ever stood related to him in the holiest interests of his being, and to his offices has he looked as the last means by which he was to be delivered from misery, and raised to happiness and bliss.

To the minister, therefore, by way of eminence, pertains the dignity of a public benefactor. To his charge is committed in this world the governance and management of God's plan, and His historical dealings with men. He is God's representative, and mediates between him and his creatures. He is clothed with a spiritual power, which reaches the inner sanctuary of the human spirit, and enters like leaven into the life of every institution. It is through his ministrations that all history is quickened with its true life, enabled to move onward to the realization of happiness and bliss for man, and empowered to overcome the opposite ruinous tendency introduced into the world by sin.

As has already sufficiently appeared, all other historical forces combined, would be powerless to raise man above the sphere of the natural. They can make no provision for his spiritual nature. And in the midst of any amount of temporal prosperity, must leave his consciousness to languish and suffer, for the want

of that element, which is the highest and distinguishing attribute of his nature, and in which precisely centers his capability for rest in the ultimate perfection of his being. To this all past history bears its ample testimony. The most cursory glance over its dark pages before Christ, and those of nations shut out from the power of his religion since his advent, is sufficient to make it abundantly evident that all its forces were insufficient to raise man out of his ruined estate of sin; and so far from their ability to heal his wounded consciousness, their best efforts could only serve to deepen and intensify the keenness of his sense of want, as a preparation for the revelation of Christianity, as the only power which could restore his nature. Since the time of its revelation, the whole stream of history has been enlightened by its power. It entered into it as its controlling, vivifying element. And notwithstanding the many attempts which have been made to account for the phenomenon of modern history, as the result of merely natural causes, it stands attested this day by the *consciousness* of every Christian man, which lies back of all his reasoning, that it is the legitimate outworkings of Christianity as its vital leaven.

This being the case, very little reflection is needed to see, in what relation the ministry, into whose hands this interest is committed, must stand to society, and to history in general. While other agencies are ever active in carrying forward its forces; while art would remand rebellious nature back again to its lawful subordination to man; while science would unlock the hidden mysteries of knowledge; while government would gather together her children, and seek to enlighten, protect and defend them; yet can these agencies be effectual for a truly beneficial end, only as all are taken up and comprehended in that great revelation of the divine will, as comprehended in the institutions of our holy religion. The artisan is necessary to meet the daily wants of society, the teacher to enlighten and expand the intellect, the civil officer to order the movements and direct the steps of the citizen; but it remains for the minister to mediate that power which comprehends and penetrates all these, revealing their significance and conducting them onward to that higher destiny that lies beyond the confines of this world.

That the Ambassador of Christ is entitled to, and necessarily must occupy this first and controlling position with reference to society, has ever been felt and acknowledged. The powers of darkness have ever sought to depose him from this position, simply for the purpose, that sundering the order of nature from that of grace, the world might be cut loose from its spiritual moorings, and left to drift into the vortex of anarchy, ignorance and destruction. The scholar has sought to make reason the measure of truth, and to teach man that his highest good lay in obedience to its deductions. The politician has discovered in an ideal state this same interest, and decreed a divorce between matters civil and religious. But against all this does the human spirit file its persistent protest, and has hearkened to the voice of the Gospel as the key-note of the harmonies of its being.

Herein do we discern the reason why the ministers of religion have to so large an extent been made to stand so near to the central point of power in all the departments of our human life. The sciences, notwithstanding their repeated efforts to break their allegiance to religion, and to array themselves against its claims, have ever yet been brought back by their agency, and made repentantly to confess to their office as handmaidens. Fast by the throne of imperial power, in Christian lands, has there ever stood the Christian minister; and even though at times his voice may have been disregarded, yet has the ruler been powerless to resist its force or ignore its effect upon his spirit and conduct. He (the minister) it is who gives shape and tone to our institutions of learning, and through them down to the private walks of life, does Christianity govern the development of mind. In all the public movements of the day, having reference to the weal of society, and the amelioration of the condition of our race, the minister, by common consent, is called to the foremost ranks, and allowed in large measure to control and shape the organization. In the affairs of communities and towns and villages, he is looked upon as a public man, and felt to stand at the head of the general and most precious interests of the people. In every interest involving education, moral reform and common beneficence, he is expected to take a

leading part. To him society looks up for counsel in the formation of its opinions and the determination of its questions of policy. And all this, too, not so much because of his superiority in intelligence, or the greater correctness of his judgment, as because of the conscious sense of his relation to it, in the deeper and more solemn interests of its spiritual wants. He is invested with a power and dignity even in the eyes of wicked men, and by his simple presence he restrains their wayward actions. What consistent minister has not noticed that vice draws back from his approach; the voice of profanity is hushed when he appears; demonstrations of wickedness are, as a general thing, suspended as he passes by; and indulgence in passion and appetite shrink from his observation as from a forbidding and unfriendly power. Even the children learn to know him in his official and public character, and by their modest reserve and polite salutation acknowledge and profess their conscious appreciation of his sacred office.

Moreover, in his position as counsellor and advisor in the midst of his people and community, is his character as the representative of a higher and general interest more fully acknowledged. When business entanglements confound the judgment; when social differences refuse to be adjusted by the ordinary rules of wisdom and prudence; when sorrow, like a strong man, breaks through the sacred defences of home, and bereavement unnerves the energies, and spreads the pall of darkness over the bright prospects of hope; or when the wounded spirit writhes under a keen sense of its derelictions, how turns the heart to that heavenly power, which alone can bring order out of the wildest confusion, and afford a solace for every ill! Then does the soul pant for an enlightening wisdom, and a sympathizing heart, which it feels this world possesses not, other than in him who stands the representative of *that One*, whose sympathies were schooled in the experience of every human sorrow, and whose power to deliver is illustrated by his conquest over death and the grave.

Of the eminence of his position among the children of men, and the moulding power of his influence, should every minister

make solemn earnest. He may not regard his office as a mere cloak or badge of authority, but rather the power of a living principle lodged in his person. As such, he is true to it only as he surrenders himself to its control, and allows it to shape his life and utter itself in his conduct. He can be a teacher of the truth, and a faithful steward of the spiritual forces which govern the world, only as his walk and conversation illustrate them. His office must govern him, and be allowed to assert its dignity and authority in his every-day relations to his fellow-men. Thus alone will he commend himself to the favorable consideration of his people, and assure their consciousness, which constrains their outgoings towards him. That civil officer—that Judge can but illy subserve the claims of justice and good order in the community, whose life is a mockery of his office, and whose conduct fails to give expression to its dignity. There must be in the minister a conscious apprehension of his office as divine; then will he command the respect to which he is entitled, and be effective for good in his labors. Indiscretions, therefore, and undignified conduct on his part, not to mention vices and crimes, will be like dead flies in the apothecary's ointment. For the people are justly jealous of the conduct of their public men. Condescension to small and vulgar acts and expressions, improper associations, undue subserviency to temporal interests, and especially indulgences and amusements of questionable propriety, will inevitably prove damaging to his efficiency, cripple his efforts for good, and inflict a corresponding injury upon the cause of Christ. How sadly does not that minister's labor result in detriment, rather than in good to the community, who allows himself to play the buffoon, to swagger with coarse familiarity or presumptuous affectation of importance, to make unseemly displays of a horse-jockey propensity; or, on the other extreme, to swell with pride and vanity, and play the gloved and laced ecclesiastical dandy? How can such an one fill his place as an agent, in the outworkings of God's solemn purpose in the creation and redemption of the world? How, be a moulder and shaper of the onward progress of history, and be a guide of souls to the Lamb of God.

If the view we have taken of the grave and commanding relation which this sacred office holds to the history of the world be correct, we may with profit, in the way of conclusion, turn our thoughts to a contemplation of the solemnity and importance of the future which seems to lie before us as a nation. We not unfrequently hear loud and pompous pretensions proclaimed by our more ardent and boastful politicians, as to the importance and controlling power of our country. And while as American citizens we are prone to sympathize in their enthusiasm to a greater or less extent, still, do we not often feel inclined, in common with the jealousy of other nations, to attribute this to the blustering spirit of "Young America," and credit largely to our national vanity? Yet are we confronted with too much of reality and fact, to allow ourselves to dispose of the whole matter in this humiliating way. The position which the United States have come within the last half century, and especially within the last few years to occupy with reference to the other nations of the world, the influence they exert in moulding and casting their progress, may well give the color of reality to the assumption, that on them as a nation, devolves the burden and honor of leadership, in at least the more immediate advance of the world's progress.

It is not necessary at this time, to call to mind any considerable number of the manifold indications, which would go to justify this conviction. We stop to notice a very few of these, and that with the greatest brevity. Our most prominent characteristic, that of unexampled energy and progress, is rightly to be estimated, only as we place it in contrast with the stagnation which has come to characterize most of the older nations. We discern in their movements and visages, the effects and marks of age, while the warm, bounding pulsations of youth inspire our every undertaking. We seem to be actuated by a consciousness which tells of a mission of mighty import, demanding extraordinary resources and a wide-spread domain for its fulfilment. We feel that the vastness of our work requires an emancipation from the constraints which hem in the activities of other nations. The resources and territorial limits,

which were ample for their day and mission, are totally inadequate to the requirements laid upon our shoulders. It is doubtless the stirring of this very consciousness within us, that begets our characteristic hurry and impetuosity. What was once a year for the world, must be compressed into the limits of a month. The extraordinary must be brought down to the level of the ordinary, and what was once the endowment of the great and mighty, must come to be the heritage of man in the ordinary walks of life. How have the mighty works and valorous achievements of other nations, been robbed of their lustre and brightness, by the almost miraculous demonstrations of our energy and ingenuity! As it were in a day, have we so far outstripped our compeers in the march of history, as to place us unquestionably in the lead, and to divest us of those restraints which their jealousy and their power had sought to impose upon us.

And now, may we ask, is all this a mere freak of fortune—a happy chance which has fallen to our lot in the game of history? Is it a mere spasmodic and frenzied demonstration in the life of humanity? If so, then is there "method in its madness." Shall we take to ourselves the glory of all this, and profanely say that our own arm hath wrought it? Or shall we reverently recognize the hand of that God, who raises up one nation and casts another down, all for his own glory, and the accomplishment of his righteous purposes?

Again, we may notice our almost limitless expanse of territory, and that too, shut out from the encroachments and jostlings of other nations. This fact too, we are bound to regard as providential, and as bespeaking the vastness of the task charged to our accomplishment. But more especially should we discern a significance, in the stupendous natural resources which are committed to our hands. We were accustomed to hear, not many years ago, of the wonderful mineral wealth of some of our States. But what are these compared with the results of recent discoveries. Resources, ten-thousand fold greater than our fathers ever dreamed of. Let us but try to imagine the value of a mine of wealth, a thousand by fifteen

hundred miles in extent, and that too, as yet, but here and there made to pour forth its hidden treasures, and the mind is confounded. And now when we reflect, who it was that created this immensity of resource, and who bestowed it where it lies; when we remember that God made nothing in vain, and in wisdom appointed their uses, who dares to say that God did not appoint this provision, for the execution of the very work which He has committed to our hands?

True, all these things pertain to the sphere of the natural. But still are they comprehended as means in the plan of creation, and are appointed to subserve its revelation and completion.

All this now may serve to suggest to our minds, the part Providence designs this nation to take in the future history of the world. And as we have already seen the place the minister occupies in shaping its unfolding, we are prepared to form some estimate of the solemn responsibility which must rest upon him.

Truth and error, the powers of darkness and the Church, are this day in conflict for the mastery, as to which shall control and govern the momentous issues which are bound up in the destinies of our beloved land. The fearful extent to which error, whether in the form of infidelity or of false theology, has come to occupy the mind and heart of this nation, may well cause anxious thought, as to the issue of the conflict. We rejoice, however, in the faith, that our history must and will be true to God's purpose in the end. But this presupposes the faithfulness of those who stand His messengers, and who officially wield the power that governs the world. If ever there was a period that called loudly for a vindication of truth as over against error—that demanded the assertion of a sound Christological theology, as opposed to all false and defective systems, that period is the one in which we live. It unquestionably then is the duty of the minister to give special heed to this precise interest as of paramount importance. Not that the fearfully solemn matter of the salvation of the soul of the individual is to be accounted as calling for less earnest and la-

borious effort, but that the assertion of true faith, as the vitalizing force and truth of history, should more than ever command his indefatigable labor.

Art. IV.—THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.*

We distinguish between the *dogma* of the Atonement and a *theory* of the Atonement. The dogma is revealed for faith, and as such is to be received on the authority of the revelation. That Christ offered Himself as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world, and that forgiveness of sins is preached on the ground of that expiation, is a fact of divine revelation which continues in every age to be received by faith. But the human mind seeks to penetrate the articles of faith, and construct a theory in regard to them, which shall show their relation in a general system. These theories may fail at certain points to give full satisfaction without necessarily vitiating the dogma itself; and yet it is also true that they sustain a very intimate connection with it. A false theory persistently maintained, if on a vital point, does vitiate in the end the article of faith itself.

It is becoming more and more evident that the theories of the Atonement which have seemed to satisfy the mind of the Church since the Reformation, are being brought under new examination. There is a manifest desire to reach a theory which will better satisfy all the conditions of the great problem. Hence, we have repeated efforts to present the subject in a new and clearer light, as in the recent works of Young and Bushnell; and on the other hand, we have earnest efforts to guard against new

---

* The Atonement. By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D.D., Professor of Didactic, Historical and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa.

The Vicarious Sacrifice, Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By Horace Bushnell.

"The Light and Light of Men." An Essay by John Young, LL.D. (Edin.)

error, as in the case of Dr. Hodge's recent work. The subject has received new attention also in the Theological Quarterlies, both in this country and in Europe. We propose in the present article, not so much an attempt to criticise what we regard as inadequate and false views of the Atonement, but rather to apply to its treatment certain principles of theology familiar to the readers of this Review. We believe that they possess peculiar advantages in the treatment of this, as well as other dogmas, and where properly applied will throw new light upon many subjects which otherwise present insuperable difficulties in their scientific statement. Whether we shall be able successfully to apply them to the subject in hand, or not, we must ask beforehand that the truth of the principles themselves must not be judged by any want of success in this respect.

In order to obtain an adequate view of the Atonement, in its restricted sense, it is necessary that we should view it, not as an isolated work, but in its relations and connections with the whole work of Christ in which it stands. It is very evident that Christ did more for man than merely make an expiation for his sin. He did more than merely remove the calamity of the fall by taking away the curse of sin. This is clear. His work does not leave humanity where sin found it, but in addition to its deliverance from the curse, He raises it up to a glorified, undying state in the heavenly world. He carries it through its probation, through death, and places it where it attains what we may suppose to be the true destiny for which it was originally created. In receiving the benefits of the Atonement, the believer receives far more; for in addition to the pardon of sin he comes into a relation to God more intimate than that in which Adam stood before the fall. And this, too, by virtue of the introduction of a new life principle which creation, or humanity, did not possess originally. The Incarnation comes before us as a *new creation*, fully commensurate with the first creation, and designed to carry up to its completion and consummation that first creation in a new order of life. It is the coming in of the supernatural as the necessary complement and fulfillment of the merely natural.

What is usually understood as the Atonement, viz., the making satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ, is only a part of this one great and glorious work. That work consists primarily in the union of the divine and the human natures in Christ, and in the glorification of humanity in the heavenly sphere in the person of Christ. As a consequence of this, and the end to which it looked from the beginning, the way is now opened to bring men into participation with this heavenly glory in their eternal redemption.

It is reasonable to suppose that the end thus attained was in the divine mind originally. We cannot suppose that it is a mere afterthought of God, as though He had in view another and different destiny for man, and that his destiny, as now reached through the incarnation and death of Christ, is something which was not included in the divine purpose in his creation. Equally abhorrent would it be to suppose that while this was the end God had in view for man originally, yet it could not be realized except through the fall, and that therefore, though it was a free act, yet sin was a necessity in the eternal purpose of God. No view that makes sin a necessity, whether that of supralapsarianism or that of certain German philosophers, can be maintained. But now, if there was for man a glorious destiny originally, above the state and condition in which he was created, and if the destiny which he attains in Christ must be regarded as substantially the realization of that original destiny, then it follows that sin appears in our world only as an obstacle in the way to be removed, a parenthesis in the grand onward flow of the kingdom of God. As such it cannot be regarded as a fundamental principle in its relation to Christ's work, but rather as a hindrance which now conditions the manner or form of that work. In other words, the problem involved in the incarnation is the union of the divine and human, the Creator and the creature, the natural and the supernatural, in order to bind man and the whole creation in harmonious union with God in the heavenly sphere. We must, therefore, inquire how the presence of sin conditions the work of Christ in necessitating an Atonement.

It may be objected to this view that in the Scripture the coming of Christ into the world is continually referred to the Atonement as its end. From the first promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," down through the whole development of that promise, everything is made to point to the death of Christ as the end of His coming, and therefore it is going beyond the record to find another end for which He became incarnate.

Our answer to this is that the Scripture regards man as he is historically, and directs itself to that which is of *immediate* importance, that which relates to his immediate necessities. Sin now is his immediate misery, and deliverance from it is his immediate necessity. Therefore it refers to this first. So, for instance, the original deliverance referred directly to Egypt, and the promised reward to Canaan, and yet we know that these were only types of a still greater deliverance and a still greater reward. But in addition to this, there are passages of Scripture which do bring out a work of greater scope than merely the Atonement; passages which refer to Christ as sustaining an original and eternal relation to man, and to His work as comprehending far more than merely man's deliverance from sin. He is the first-born of every creature, the last Adam, who comes, not merely to deliver man from sin and death, but to gather all things in one, whether things in heaven or things in earth. Indeed, so fully was the early Church imbued with this thought, as brought out in the wonderful and all-glorious fact of the Incarnation, that they were occupied with it more than with the death of Christ. The great problems of the Incarnation and the death of Christ wrought more powerfully in the first ages than the problem of the Atonement, in the restricted sense. This is, indeed, often regarded as an evidence of obtuseness and error; but it is far more sensible, we think, to find in it just the truth that explains it, that the problem of the person of Christ involves far more than merely an Atonement for sin.

We start, then, with the position that it was God's original design in creating man, and that it is the ultimate scope of the

Incarnation, to unite man in a free and glorious union with God. The creation went out from God by His own free act through the Logos; it returns to God through the God-man. Or, as this thought is beautifully expressed by *Martensen*:* "In the general revelation of Logos, the Son of God is pre-supposed by every creature as being the One *through* whom all things are created, and in whom all things shall be summed up and gathered together as their head. In his revelation as Logos, the Son proceeded from the Father as God (εν μορφῇ Θεου); in His revelation in Christ on the contrary, He returns back to the Father as God-man. This return is richer than His outgoing, for He comes back with an entire kingdom of children of God, ('Behold, I and the children thou hast given me,' Heb. ii. 13)." Or in the expressive words of Irenæus, which stand as the motto of this REVIEW: "Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans"—one Jesus Christ our Lord, who came into the universal order of created things, to re-head all things in Himself. And this is only the Pauline idea, based on Eph. i. 10.

This work of re-heading the race, and through it the whole creation, in Christ, is involved in the Incarnation. This is the *punctum saliens* of the whole mission of Christ as the mediator between God and man. Here humanity was first brought into personal union with divinity. We say *humanity*, for however much Dr. Hodge may argue against the reality of that generality which we call humanity, any other position necessarily involves error in regard to the person of Christ itself. It must be conceded by all who hold the orthodox view on this subject, that the Son of God in His conception and birth did not join Himself to an *individual* of our race, either in germ or at any stage of development. If, then, the individual life only is real, and the race life, or human nature, as general, is only a thought or conception of the mind,—an abstraction,—then we are driven to the conclusion that the Logos really joined Himself to an

* Martensen's Dogmatics.

abstraction. This is brought out by what St. John says: "The Word became *flesh*," not man, a man, but flesh; by which evidently we are to understand human nature as a generality, distinguished from its individual form. On this point, however, we may have more to present presently.

The first question, now, that meets us is, What was the condition of that humanity which Christ assumed, and how did it come into that condition? That humanity was fallen when Christ came, all will acknowledge. It follows, then, that the humanity which Christ assumed was fallen; for He took it, not as it was in Adam before the fall, but as it was historically in the Virgin Mary, whom as Protestants we must regard as involved in the universal fall. The nature which Christ assumed was in a position of rebellion against God, and under His wrath, and the law of death. How did it come to be in this condition? Dr. Hodge answers by the juridical theory. Adam was the federal head of the race, the *legal* representative of all his descendants, by the covenant of works. When he fell, God imputed his guilt to all the members of the race, so that they are guilty, not first because they are descended by natural generation from Adam, but because of this legal imputation. How they become sinful is a different question with Dr. Hodge. This fact may derive some explanation from the organic character of the race, though even here he ridicules the idea that such a fact as sin can be perpetuated by natural generation.

We answer the question, how did human nature come into this state of sin and death? first, by the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise; secondly, that this fallen nature is perpetuated in all their descendants. Adam is the generic head of the race; when he fell human nature fell in him, and now all its members are involved in one common sin and guilt. We care not to go at length into the discussion of realism and nominalism, of creationism and traducianism, here, although in some of its aspects the point is vital as regards the theory of the Atonement we intend to present. Dr. Hodge tries to show that even Augustine could not

have been a realist, because he was not a traducianist. According to his logic no one can be a realist who is not a traducianist. His logic here, however, is too strong for the facts. Augustine, though he wavered as to the metaphysical question between creationism and traducianism, *was*, to all intents and purposes, a realist of the most pronounced character, and his writings abundantly show this, and are quoted by Dr. Shedd, who is himself, as Dr. Hodge acknowledges, an avowed realist, to prove it.* Did our space allow, we might give quotations to almost any extent. That Anselm held to the same view must be evident to any one who will examine his words.

But Dr. Hodge says: "The doctrine of the Reformed Churches could not have been Realistic, because Calvin and the Reformed theologians, almost to a man, were Creationists." Here again is an evident effort to force out facts by logic. "Calvin could not have been a Realist because he was a Creationist." But suppose his words prove that he was a Realist, what then? Simply that he was not as logical as Dr. Hodge. But we have nothing to do with Calvin's logic when we are considering the facts in the case. It would be just as difficult, perhaps, for Dr. Hodge to make Calvin's views on the sacraments agree logically with his view of the decrees, and yet Calvin held to both. Instead of showing weakness of intellect it is often an evidence of true greatness of mind to hold what are sometimes called antinomies. At any rate we have no right to make our logic the test of what others, as great and good as we, have believed and taught. Any one who desires to read what Calvin did hold on this subject, need go no farther than his Institutes, p. 227: "When we hold, according to the Scriptures, that *sin was communicated* from the first man to all his posterity, Pelagius urges that it was communicated by imitation, *not by propagation.* Therefore good men, and beyond all others Augustine, have labored to demonstrate that we are not corrupted by any adventitious means, but that we derive an innate depravity from our very birth . . . . Thus it is certain that Adam was not only the progenitor, but as it were the *root*

* See quotations from Augustine in Hist. Ch. Doctrine, by Dr. Shedd, p. 77.

of mankind, and therefore that all the race were necessarily vitiated in his corruption." Calvin then goes on to say that this must be held, *notwithstanding* the dispute between Creationism and Traducianism, as though he felt the difficulty as regards logic to which Dr. Hodge refers, but did not allow it to stand in the way of a theory which comes with such overwhelming force both from Scripture and reason.

But there are minds quite as acute and logical in our own day who hold fully to the reality of humanity, or human nature, as a generality, and explain the imputation of sin by it, over against a mere judicial imputation *ad extra*, who yet are not decided as to the question between Creationism and Traducianism, but who combine the two, as Ebrard, and also Martensen, though the latter inclines more to Traducianism. Are they then not Realists, because Dr. Hodge could not be a Realist, and not be a Traducianist? The facts are too much for his argument.

It may be difficult indeed to explain the presence of guilt in this view. All we can say is that its explanation lies in the organic relation of individual will to will as it acted freely in Adam. But this difficulty is not at all removed by the juridical theory. That theory makes the individual to be guilty because of a judgment of God precedent to his sinful state. This is just as unreasonable as any theory of guilt can be. God's judgments are not fictitious. He pronounces each individual of the human family guilty *because* he is a partaker in the sin of the fall, in other words, because he is involved in sin by reason of his organic relation to fallen humanity. We will only add here, in regard to this whole subject of imputation, that we do not mean that the sin of Adam, in eating the forbidden fruit, is carried down as an act now past, to each individual, and that he becomes responsible for it in that sense. Imputation internally would become just as mechanical in this form as in the outward imputation. A sinful act, in its connection with our nature, is a living fact, which is never past as to its real power and life, until it is overcome. The man who steals to-day is equally a thief to-morrow, if the sin be not

purged away. Adam's sin, as an act of rebellion against God, *lives on* in the race, and as thus present we are guilty of it. But with God it is one thing throughout, from beginning to end.

Without pursuing this point further now, we proceed with our statement.

Christ having assumed human nature is to make atonement *in* human nature as well as *for* it. The problem comes before us primarily in this form: What is required in order that fallen humanity in His person may be lifted up out of its fallen condition, and glorified in the heavenly sphere? We answer first, it must be rendered sinless. We say *rendered* sinless, because the sinlessness of Jesus signifies something more than mere passive or negative innocence. It lies in the very nature of the holy conception of Jesus by the Holy Ghost, that sin was eliminated at that beginning point of His life, so that there already the victory over sin commenced. It is not to be inferred, however, that His subsequent life was not henceforth occupied with the problem of sin as related to His person. Because He assumed fallen human nature, and by virtue of His relation to that nature as the second Adam, He came into direct personal conflict with the powers of sin, and by a free exercise of His will turned it from Him and overcame it. Hence the temptation of Christ, as we contemplate it first in the wilderness, was not a sham. The conflict was real. And the victory was not a fate and necessity, nor an overpowering exertion of His divinity, but it was a free act, in which the human will of Christ performed its functions without in any way having violence done to its freedom.

Thus throughout all the stages of development of the human nature in His person, by His free obedience He not only preserved that humanity free from all stain of sin, but He made it victorious against all the assaults of sin. In this conflict and victory we have presented to us what is called the active obedience of Christ, as forming an element in the Atonement which He made for the world. The significance of His life in this respect for our common humanity, is similar to that of the act

of our first parents in the garden of Eden. It was a second trial or test for the redemption of the world, just as the first was a trial as humanity stood in the original creation. Hence the sinlessness of Jesus, His active obedience, is vital for our redemption, not merely as preparing Him for the sinless offering which He was to make, nor as so much merit to be set over to our account; but primarily as involving the successful solution of the problem of gaining the victory over sin, as this problem was involved in His own person in its relation to humanity. It is commonly said that the terms of the covenant required that the sacrifice when offered must be a spotless one, that one who is himself a sinner could not make satisfaction for the sins of others; but we must not therefore conclude that the only significance of the awful conflict with sin in which Christ engaged, and the glorious victory which he gained, find their only significance as preparatory to His death. Rather, we repeat, are we to find its primary meaning in that conquest over the combined powers of sin, which constituted humanity in Him a victor in the trial, a trial on which a second time hung the question of man's destiny.

The significance of Christ's work entirely must be found first in its relation to His own person. This is the point of departure for the different theories of the Atonement. The Juridical theory of Dr. Hodge, no less than the Moral Influence theory of Bushnell, or the Governmental theory of the New England theology, finds this significance in what it is for men directly, whereas in our view redemption in the fullest sense is wrought out primarily in the person of Christ, in order that from thence the fruits of His mission and work may be made over to all who believe on His name.

Do we mean then that Christ redeems Himself first? Was He in need of redemption? Was He not born sinless, and could victory over sin have any advantage for Him? This requires us to consider now, as throwing light also upon our first point, in what sense Christ became a substitute for sinful man, or in what sense our sins were laid upon Him, as the Scriptures declare.

Dr. Bushnell answers this question by asserting that our sins were laid upon Him in the way of sympathy for us in our misery. He labors to show that His tender sympathy for the afflicted, and His labor of love in healing them, fulfills the meaning of the prophecy, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He says: "For He took them not literally upon Him, but only assumed them to bear in a way of pains-taking labor, and exhaustive sympathy, and disgustful attention, coupled with much abuse and little gratitude." Here the work of redeeming is an outward one, much as a physician goes into a hospital to take upon him the work of healing the sick there. It does not help the matter that in the case of Christ the sympathy and the power are deep and full, because they are divine as well as human. According to this view the conflict with sin and suffering is not a conflict within His own person, having its significance first for His person, or rather humanity in His person, but for bodies and souls around Him.

Dr. Hodge maintains that our sins and sufferings were laid upon Him by an outward imputation, so that His sufferings were of a penal character in that sense. It answers the case, however, no better than the other. It does not account at all properly for the Incarnation. If we ask why the Son of God became incarnate in order to become our substitute, it would most probably be answered that the same being that sinned must make satisfaction for sin, for in the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, God would not punish another for the sins that man has committed. Therefore Christ could not have assumed angelic nature, and suffered for us in that form. This is true when the necessity for assuming human nature is properly understood. But we maintain that the Juridical or satisfaction theory does not explain this necessity. Christ, according to that theory, is, to all intents and purposes, *other* than the one who sinned. The very conception of imputation which it sets forth implies this; for God accepts a substitute, and requires that the penalty of sin shall fall upon him as a foreign burden. It is hard to see, indeed, why Christ, according to this theory, could not have come in the nature of an angel, or why He

could not have created a finite nature to be joined with His divinity, since the case required only that He should suffer a certain penalty in order to make satisfaction for man's sin, but not necessarily that He should suffer it in human nature.

In opposition to this, and every other theory which makes the imputation of our sin and misery to Christ to be of this outward character, we maintain that Christ took upon Him our sin and misery in the fact of His assuming our nature as fallen, and as Himself the second Adam. Free from all sin Himself, and victorious over it at every point in His life, yet by reason of His relation to the race as the second Adam, its absolute head, the burden of sinful humanity rested upon Him in a deeper sense than that of mere outward imputation.

In considering this point, it is well to bear in mind the problem which Christ had before Him, viz.: not merely to make atonement for sin, but to unite human nature with the divine, and raise it up to a glorified state, in order that the individuals of the human family by receiving life from this new fountain of life might be raised up with Him to glory and immortality. Now what He did and what He suffered were a part of this work. His sufferings and death were on the way He was to move, in carrying our humanity into the heavenly sphere, and that, too, by virtue of the relation He sustained to the race through His incarnation.

We must view Him now as taking upon Him, in virtue of the very constitution of His person, our sins, as involving the suffering of the consequences of the violated law of God, and this, too, as including the determination of God against sin in the form of wrath. He took upon Him our sin as involving not only *suffering*, but also *guilt*.

Christ experienced the consequences of violated law, though He Himself had broken no law, but only honored the divine law at every point by perfect obedience. He stood in the centre of the world's fallen life, Himself holy, and against Him rushed the currents of a discordant humanity. He was keenly sensitive to every throb of suffering man. Not by way of sympathy merely, but in sympathy *because* of the organic unity

of life between Him and the world, He experienced the burden of human suffering and woe. We may find analogies to this mystery, even though we cannot fully explain it. If the hand is wounded the whole body, even though the centre of life remains sound, experiences the pain. The functions of the body go forward regularly, but they find an obstruction in that member, which reacts and produces pain until the obstruction is overcome by the victory of healthy life over the wound. A family has fallen into disgrace. It has incurred the penalty of a violated law, so that in its character as an organism it is made to suffer. Its head is innocent, personally, yet as its head and therefore its representative, the parent comes under the ban. He suffers with and for the family. By separating himself from his family he could escape the consequences, but he chooses to remain there for his family's sake. A tribe or nation has fallen into disgrace, involved itself in suffering. A good man assumes the position of its head and ruler. If any one now should be singled out for punishment, the blow would certainly fall upon him. He bears it and the nation is freed from the ban. These are only analogies, and do not, by any means, cover the mystery of Christ's relation to the race. That relation is of the deepest and most intimate character. He is not only a member of the race, but the centre of it. He is the true and absolute head of the race. Accordingly He is called the *root* as well as the offspring of Jesse. When He came into the world He came unto *His own*. And now standing thus at the very heart of humanity, every current of human sorrow and misery carries its burden to His soul and He suffers for man.

But sin not only brings suffering as a consequence of violated law, but as a free moral act it must refer the suffering continually to a determination of God against it in the form of wrath. The divine wrath may be called, indeed, impeded love, but this must not be understood as though God remained unaffected by sin. We need not say, indeed, with Delitzsch,* that "wrath and love are not merely the several modes of God's feeling;

* System of Biblical Psychology, p. 172.

but two principles, distinct as fire and light, of the everlasting glorious revelation of His nature;" or that, just in those words : "The Son of love betook Himself down into the depths of the Godhead's wrath, clothed the humanity, which had forfeited the divine likeness, with His own absolute divine likeness, took the wrath upon Himself, and annihilated it in Himself,—and thus brought back the creature that had fallen from love, again to the principle into which it had been created;" yet however we may define the wrath of God, we must regard it as a real determination of God against sin, which has its counterpart in the fear and terror of the sinner.

The subjective theory of the Atonement teaches that all this is a mistake. There is no such determination in God, but that sin only affects the subject sinning, and that all that is necessary is to overcome this feeling of distrust and fear on the part of man, in order that the divine love may again be recognized as flowing into him. If our consciousness of the divine wrath against us by reason of sin is only a fiction, we could have no evidence that our consciousness of His love is aught else, and we would be left in skepticism and doubt in regard to all the determinations of God's being.

There was wrath in the cup which our Saviour drank to the dregs, although there was in Him the triumph of faith by which He clung to the divine love. This is sometimes said to involve a mere play or drama. Christ knew He was the object of the Father's love, and the Father was in Him and with Him in the propitiatory offering; how, then, could He really come under the divine wrath? It may, indeed, be difficult to explain what seems thus to be a double consciousness, but it is only the same difficulty that lies in the doctrine of the *Kenosis* all through the life of Christ,—not more difficult than to explain how He *could increase in favor with God*, when in one view He was eternally in absolute favor.

But the Juridical theory just as really fails to state the case fully at this point, when it teaches that the fact of Christ's bearing our humanity was not the cause of His enduring the wrath of God, but the fact merely that as an innocent person

He was suffering for others. He did suffer under the wrath of God for others, but those others were now, as to the deepest centre of their life, *in* Him. It is humanity in Him which, in the terrors and sufferings of Gethsemane and the cross, is passing through the necessary conditions by which alone it could rise from its state of condemnation and death, to the favor of God, to life and immortality.

Violence is always done to this awful mystery when at this point we array two parties acting as by covenant or contract —when God the Father exacts the penalty, and the Son comes to comply with the demand. The fulness of the Godhead is in the Son, as well as in the Father, and the Atonement was one act of God, and it is God, in the Person of the Son, who carries our nature up through the determinations in the divine nature against fallen humanity, as necessary to man's salvation. Thus we would seek to explain Christ's consciousness of the wrath of God against sin, by the presence in Him of that humanity, which, though sinless in Him personally, was organically linked with the life of the race out of Him, burdened with the sin of man. In *this* sense as our representative, that is by virtue of His thus having humanity joined in His divine-human person (and not as our representative legally merely, as by an outward arrangement), He suffered the wrath of God against the sin of the world. Here we have one side of the Atonement satisfied; but this is only one side.

We must now take up again what is the active central principle, after all, in both His active and passive obedience, or His obedience and suffering, viz.: the fountain of undying life in His person, by which the final victory is to be gained over death and hell, and a new sphere of blessed immortality gained for our humanity. If we are to find in the constitution of His person that which makes the Atonement sufficient, on the side of suffering, we must find also in that person the source of another equally necessary side of the Atonement, viz.: the positive deliverance of humanity from the power of death, and its exaltation to the heavenly, glorified state.

This deliverance is sometimes looked upon in a way which

makes it to stand in no necessary inward connection with the constitution of His person, or the struggle passed through in His death and resurrection. The Atonement is regarded as closed by His death, and the resurrection as an act of divine power involving new and different activities. But His resurrection was involved in the problem of His life from the beginning. His life was moving historically towards this goal. That which was in the sphere of the earthly was to pass into the sphere of the heavenly as its legitimate end; and that, too, in such sense as gathering up in His life at this point all the merits of His death. That death was anything but an isolated fact, a mere suffering of a certain penalty, by which in this separate view the anger of God was to be appeased, and by looking at which in faith the sinner was to receive justification. Anything, we say, but that. In that view it would, at best, have been only negative in its results. The justice of God is satisfied, the penalty is borne, the law honored, but what now of the interests of that humanity which Christ had assumed? All those interests, we may say, hang upon the issue of His conquering death and rising from the dead. Not only that He may come forth to reveal the fact of His propitiatory death as a testimony for faith, but as rising now into the sphere of that higher world, in which all the fruits of His life, His death, His victory over death, are gathered up in His glorified life.

Thus the Scriptures regard His resurrection. Thus He Himself first speaks of it. "*Ought* not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?" Is this not the end to which all the prophecies point, the issue that is necessarily involved in His person and work? The value of His death is made by the Apostles to rest in the glorious fact of His resurrection. If Christ be not raised then is your faith vain, ye are yet in your sins. They preached Christ and the resurrection, preached the resurrection as carrying with it and in it, our justification, our deliverance from sin, and our birth to a new life.

It is ominous that a work like that of Dr. Hodge, in which he evidently intends to go over the whole ground of the Atone-

ment, makes no reference to the resurrection of Christ. This fact is not to be explained by saying that he intended merely to treat of His death; for he does refer to His life of obedience, and what he regards as its meaning and relation to our Saviour's death. If what went before is discussed, that which immediately follows might be considered as well. Not even in the discussion of the application of the Atonement does the subject of Christ's resurgent life receive any notice whatever. We say this is ominous. It shows clearly that in Dr. Hodge's theory of the Atonement the resurrection of Christ has no place. Whatever its meaning may be in redemption, it does not belong here. Dr. Bushnell, though his view looks constantly and only to the subjective side of the Atonement, and though he seeks to find in Christ the real power and life which *in* us effects our reconciliation with God, yet seems to find no place for the resurrection of Christ, as an epoch, a transition in His life and work, in which precisely human nature rises to its true immortality, and becomes a fountain of heavenly grace for man.

Yet here, in our view, the interest culminates. Here only we come to that fuller and better conception of the Atonement, as an At-one-ment. Here it is that we can now leave the narrower, technical meaning of the word, which limits it to merely making satisfaction for sin, (a meaning right and proper in its place), and take in a wider scope, the bringing of the human really into harmonious undying union (at-one-ment) with the divine in the heavenly world. Thus the Atonement was wrought out in our nature, it is objectively complete, and the way is now open for its application by the advent of the Holy Spirit.

When the Atonement is regarded merely in the light of a certain penalty paid to satisfy the claims of justice, and as bringing about a reconciliation between God and man, it is not possible to understand properly the mission of the Holy Ghost, or the nature of the Church as related to Christ. Hence, according to the Juridical theory of Dr. Hodge, the application of the Atonement is a new and separate transaction upon which God enters, now that satisfaction for sin has been made. A

free pardon has been purchased, which God now grants to those who are included in the divine decree. This pardon would be of no avail if it were not followed by a work of grace in the human soul. Hence, in making over the pardon, God regenerates and sanctifies the elect by a new and separate work of the Spirit. The Atonement only removed the obstacle which prevented God from revealing His goodness to man. Christ becomes thus only the instrumental cause of applied redemption, instead of being its fontal source. This appears from the following words which Dr. Hodge employs in reference to this point: "*We believe that God could have changed man's subjective moral condition by the direct action of His Holy Spirit upon the human soul, without the objective exhibition of His love by means of such a sacrifice as that made in the person of His Son.*" If this means anything at all it means that there is no necessary subjective connection between the Atonement of Christ and the work of grace performed in the human soul through the Holy Ghost. And it is difficult, in this view, to see why the Holy Spirit did not come with the fulness of grace in the Old Testament dispensation, before Christ was crucified, and arose, and was glorified, as well as afterwards on the day of Pentecost. If His decree took in all who believed on Christ previous to His incarnation, why could they not enjoy complete redemption before as well as after the incarnation? We have no doubt Dr. Hodge would reply they did enjoy the same grace notwithstanding the assertion in Hebrews: "These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

Evidently, however, the Scriptures present this subject in a very different light. The glorification of Christ was necessary in order that redemption might go out from Him to men. "The Holy Ghost was not yet, because Christ was not yet glorified." The Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, is now the sphere in which the glorified theanthropic life of Christ becomes the principle of new life for His people. A new dispensation is thus opened, the dispensation of the Spirit, which gives birth to the

new order of grace, the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church. In this dispensation Christ is the source of life for those who are united to Him by the Holy Ghost. Everywhere in the New Testament He is thus spoken of. He Himself says: "I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you." "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." And the Apostles speak of Him as now living in them, the hope of glory. "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." They represent His death and resurrection as living facts. St. Paul says: "I am crucified with Christ." "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." Everywhere Christ, now risen from the dead, is referred to as the fountain of life in the new order of grace; and it is precisely in the form of life that the merit and virtue of His death are made over to them that believe. His life is more than His death, or rather His life is that in which His death becomes available for us.

If now we ask whether Christ died for all men, our theory leads us to the plain answer, He died for humanity as a whole. There can be no room for a limited Atonement in the Calvinistic sense. The Atonement in its objective character is commensurate with humanity, because it was human nature which Christ assumed. Nothing is more mechanical and abhorrent, because nothing is more contrary to the Scriptures, than that Christ atoned only for the sins of a portion of the human race. It destroys the generic character of redemption, and thus destroys the parallel drawn by the Apostle between the first and second Adam. Just as really as the first Adam included in him the life of the race, Christ, the second Adam, includes in Him also that same life, now redeemed. So the Heidelberg Catechism evidently views the case. After stating, Ques. 16, that it was our *nature* in which Christ made satisfaction for sin, as though the conclusion would follow that therefore all who are included in that nature would necessarily be saved, it proceeds to ask: "Are all men then saved by Christ as they have perished by Adam?" The answer is: "No; only such as by true faith are ingrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits."

Here is the only limitation of the Atonement. We are inserted into the fallen Adamic life by natural generation; we are inserted into redeemed humanity, the order of grace in Christ, by *re*generation. Dr. Hodge makes use of what we must regard as a puerile argument to prove that God did not design the Atonement for the whole race, when he urges this: "Christ died after generations of men had been going to perdition during four thousand years. With regard to that half of the race who perished before His advent, it is hard to see the bearings of a general redemption. And if it had no bearing upon their case, it is hard to see in what sense the redemption is general." It is *not* hard to see the bearing of a general redemption to that portion of the race, if Dr. Hodge will but consider that the promise of redemption was first made to Adam, and was available in its provisions for Cain as well as for Abel, and that it was Cain's own act of unbelief which deprived him of its benefits; that the same promise was made to Noah and all his, and that it was Ham's own act of wickedness that separated him from the blessing. God did not produce heathenism, but man made the separation in the direction of sin, while God made the separation in the direction of the good. Of a like character is his argument drawn from the heathen world since Christ. How can the Atonement be for the whole world since a large portion of the human race have no knowledge of it? Is then God responsible for this? Is it because He does not take in the heathen in the provisions of redemption? How then could we be concerned to carry that knowledge to them? The very commission to preach the gospel to all the world is based upon the fact that an Atonement has been made for the whole world. "Who will have all men to be saved." Yet not all are saved, because all will not come to the knowledge of the truth.

It is not our object to discuss at all the subject of predestination. There is a proper sense in which with the Reformed Church generally we hold it for truth; but we feel assured that its truth does not require that the Atonement in its objective character should be regarded as partial and not general.

The Juridical theory of the Atonement held and advocated by Dr. Hodge, and the Moral Influence theory of Dr. Bushnell, as well as what is called the Governmental theory, and the view presented by Dr. Young, all fail, as we conceive, by making the Atonement something *ad extra* instead of making it an Atonement *in* humanity. There is more of an effort in Bushnell and Young to find in it a power working *in* man, than in the work of Dr. Hodge; but they find it after all only a moral power, a life if you please, but not a life which comes into organic union with men in the order of grace. The error underlying all these theories, as we believe, is in regard to the *essential nature* of Christianity. None of them find it to be really a new *life* for the race. They make it to be in some way at last a scheme for saving men instead of the salvation itself, and thus Christ Himself becomes a means to an end beyond His person, and not Himself the source of life for all who believe on His name.

But here we are met by the singular argument of Dr. Hodge in regard to justification. His argument is drawn from Rom. v. 18: "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; EVEN so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now if we are condemned because we are in Adam by a life-union, then we are also justified because of our life-union with Christ. But this latter, Dr. Hodge says, is not true, therefore the former is untrue. But this latter, we affirm, is true. The sinner *is* justified because he is included in the redemption in Christ. In order to appropriate this redemption he must be engrafted into Christ, or be born again of the water and the Spirit. But this appropriation can be his personally only on condition of faith. Therefore we are said to be justified by faith. The fundamental fact, on the ground of which God pronounces the sinner just, is his sharing in the righteousness of Christ. When the woman touched the Saviour and was healed, Christ said to her: "Thy faith hath made thee whole." This was the condition on her part, and so far as activity on her part was concerned it was this which made her whole. Yet it is plain from the narrative that the efficient cause of her heal-

ing was the virtue which went out from Christ. We are justified by faith in Christ, but not as though, on this condition, the righteousness of Christ is merely reckoned to our account, without, at the same time, our inheriting that righteousness. That view of justification which sunders the declaration of pardon from the inheritance of the righteousness of Christ, sunders what God has joined together. "Therefore there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," &c. Only *in* Christ are we justified.

The argument of Dr. Hodge, that if Christ redeemed humanity generically, then He must be in union with the entire genus, including the lost, which, he says, is horrible to think of, to our mind is equally a *non sequitur*, and seems to us to betray gross ignorance of the plainest principles of organic life. If a branch is sundered from a tree and decays, does it then follow that the life of the tree is still united with the decaying branch? And is the organism divided or destroyed thereby? If a man loses an arm, does it follow that he still maintains a union with the lost member? If God should annihilate certain individuals of the human race, does it follow that humanity would be incomplete in its organic character? No more does it follow that the humanity redeemed in Christ is affected by the fact that many of the individuals of the race fall away into perdition.

Our limits will not allow us to refer particularly to the theories of the Atonement presented in the works of Bushnell and Young, named at the head of this article. As a protest, earnest and sincere, against the satisfaction theory set forth by Hodge, they must certainly find sympathy in all earnest enquirers after the truth. This latter theory resolves the solemn work of the Atonement, as Dr. Young remarks, very much into a court-house and criminal trial, and we turn from it as unsatisfactory and abhorrent. But relief from this is not to be found on the other side in any merely subjective theory of the Atonement. What we need is to bring these two sides, the objective and the subjective, to a reconciliation. This reconciliation, we believe, is to be found in what may be denominated the *Generic-Head-*

ship Theory, which we have endeavored briefly and imperfectly to state.

We will only add here yet, that all the positions which we have taken in this article are equally true, whether we hold that Christ would have become incarnate if man had not sinned or not. We have purposely stated the essential, fundamental, necessity of man to be, union with God through the Son of God.

We believe, indeed, that Christ would have become incarnate if man had not sinned. We receive the words of *Martensen* on this point as stating the truth: "If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and humanity, —if His person has not merely an historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance,—sin alone cannot have been the ground of His revelation; for there was no metaphysical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer, if it had not been eternally involved in His idea that He should be our Mediator. Are we to suppose that that which is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? That there would have been no place in the human race for the glory of the Only-Begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God; with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God; must we not necessarily ask, even if for the moment we suppose sin to have no existence: Where in this kingdom is the perfect God-man?" &c.*

But all that has been said is equally true, whether Christ would have become incarnate, had not man sinned, or not. That we must consider the subject of the Atonement, in the restricted sense, in its relation to, and as included in, the whole work which Christ performed for the world, that the satisfaction which Christ made for our sins, He made, not only for humanity, but in humanity, that the virtue and merit of the

---

* Martensen's Dogmatics, p. 260.

Atonement are contained in His undying life, as the conqueror of death and hell, and that this life is the fountain not only of pardon for sin, but also of life and immortality for us, through the Holy Ghost,—all this is not at all affected by whatever view we may take in reference to that question. Yet we believe the view of that question we have presented—held by Lange, Martensen, and other theologians of acknowledged reputation,—serves to exalt our conception of that greatest of all facts in the revelation of God and the history of the world, THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD.

ART. V.—RECENT SANITARY OPERATIONS IN EUROPE.

BY LEWIS H. STEINER.

Sanitary Institutions during the Austro-Prussian-Italian conflict, by Thomas W. Evans, M. D. Paris, 1868.

Un Souvenir de Solferino par J. Henry Dunant, Geneva, 1863.

Until the coming of the blest day, described by Isaiah, when "there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and His rest shall be glorious," and when God shall make "wars to cease unto the end of the earth," the rattle of musketry and the reverberation of cannon will break upon the ears of mankind as so many startling proofs, that brotherly love is not the reigning spirit among the nations of the earth. And until such love shall bud, blossom and bear abundant fruit, difficulties will arise, from injuries actually done or abstract principles violated, which will only be brought to settlement by force of arms. Peace conventions may be held like that of Geneva, but their members will desert their deliberations and, following Garibaldi's course, will be

found fighting for the cause they have espoused, if it should seem in peril. Indeed there can be no human panacea or antidote invented to do away with war. The people of the earth must be enlisted under the blood-stained banner of the cross for the purpose of fighting against the hosts of the arch-fiend, before they can be made to look upon the shedding of fraternal blood as something essentially repugnant to the human soul. But war may be divested of a portion of its most brutal terrors, and the soldier need not forget that his opponents as well as his fellow-combatants are entitled, when stricken down and helpless either from wounds or disease, to such kind offices as the good Samaritan extended to the man who had fallen among thieves on his journey from Jerusalem to Jericho.

It is proposed in this article to show some of the indications of philanthropic activity, which the late European war has developed, being to a certain extent an imitation of the sanitary operations carried on in our country during the Rebellion. Although this activity as a whole cannot be looked upon as a *direct* result of that brotherly love which our religion so warmly inculcates, still it must indirectly be attributed to such influence, since we are taught that every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above. Like the mild, diffused gleamings of light that usher in the dawn, such wonderful activity could never have existed had there not been a glorious sun whose rays, penetrating the thickness of darkness, bore infallible testimony to their source. In this, as in all the philanthropic promptings of the human heart, that which commands our respect and admiration is illumined by light derived from Christianity. Where the latter flourishes in purity we have philanthropy in its highest form of charity—*ἀγάπη*; when mankind shall range itself in the ranks of the followers of Christ, then this charity will produce more perfect works than can result from mere philanthropy. Until that day we must hail the deeds of the latter, as in some sense, prophetic shadowings forth of better times.

The main, indeed we might say the only object of the soldier, is to achieve victory in the quickest manner possible and with the most thorough overthrow of his opponent. Hence his suc-

cess is attended with suffering and anguish; his successful march is destruction to life; his victory is accompanied with the cries of the wounded and dying. During our late war, the sympathies of the national party were thoroughly aroused, because almost every family had contributed some of its nearest and dearest to swell the armies engaged in the contest. Desiring to bring the comforts of home to the dear ones in the field, money was freely expended, in the purchase of articles that were not incompatible with a soldier's life, and which would sooth his pillow of anguish and remind him of home sympathies. Hence arose Relief Societies, which, by consolidation into the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, acted in the field and in the hospital as the almoners of the people's gifts. It is pleasant to place it upon record, that these Commissions knew no restrictions in the exercise of their philanthropic functions, and that friend or foe, if suffering within reach of their store houses, were supplied with all relief possible. The historiographers of these commissions have endeavored to give condensed histories of their labors, but have failed to give more than an *idea* of what was done and how it was done. Still the people and the world have learned to look upon these labors as honorable to the American name. For the first time, in the history of war, succor had been brought to its sufferers by a whole nation, and an attempt on a large scale had been made to diminish the terrific anguish which is inevitably attendant upon its course.

All good deeds bear perennial fruit in the way of influencing like deeds, wherever man has learned of their existence. The good done by the Sanitary Commission, during our war, did not cease with its close, but has borne such fruits in the German war, as make us hope that all nations hereafter will count it a duty to imitate under similar circumstances. We must not claim that succor to the sick or wounded, in time of war, is an original idea with us. Religious orders have labored in this direction for centuries and have gained the admiration of the world for their self-denial. Pious men have thought it a most blessed privilege to sacrifice all comforts of home and family

for the purpose of entering upon such work: and philanthropists have been found on every battle-field, in civilized countries, whose efforts were directed to bringing succor to the wounded. During the German war the energy of Florence Nightingale secured good nursing to the soldier and freed him from many of the baneful effects of official misconduct; and the Grand Duchess Helena Paulowna, established a system of field and hospital succor, which brought more than two hundred trained woman-nurses to the hospitals at Sebastopol and Simpheropol, assigned them places in the ambulances, and in the field where the wounded were collected during the battle. "The letter of instruction" under which these women entered this service of relief opened as follows: "In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, in perfect charity and self devotion, zealously to assist the medical authorities in the care of the sick and wounded, and also to strengthen the patients under their sufferings by Christian consolation."

The attention of Europe was, however, first directed towards the necessity for some *general* action on the subject of battle-field relief, through voluntary aid properly systematized and controlled, by M. Henry Dunant a citizen of Geneva, whose experience after the battle of Solferino, which was fought June 24, 1859, has been so interestingly narrated in his *Souvenir de Solferino*. The battle resulted in killing or wounding, 3 field marshals, 9 generals 1566 commissioned officers and about 40,000 enlisted men and non-commissioned officers; and to this number may be added more than 40,000 men attacked by diseases incident to the climate or resulting from the exposure antecedent to or during the battle, making over 80,000 men broken down or killed. Mr. D. was so affected by the horrible sufferings of the wounded that he organized all the voluntary nurses, he could secure from the villages around the battle-field, and devoted himself to the grand work of relieving distress, selecting as a principal centre of his operations one of the churches of Castiglione, called Chiesa Maggiore. It would be of especial interest to quote largely from his account, but space will not admit. We can only say that the efforts of

Dunant and those who worked with him saved hundreds of lives, and led him to discuss the feasibility of establishing relief societies in time of peace, which should always be ready to render assistance to the sick and wounded in time of war, and might be made of great good during epidemics and other occasions of suffering and distress. He considered that it would not be chimerical to count upon a sufficient number of generous, sympathetic souls as ready for the formation of such societies and willing to encounter whatever danger might attend the performance of their self-imposed duties. The pages of history presented some prominent examples:—the Archbishop of Milan, Charles Borromeo, had shown a brilliant example during the pestilence of 1576; John Howard had passed his life in trying to relieve unnecessary suffering in prisons and hospitals; and others had labored in the same good cause. Why could not this nineteenth century bring forth in a larger and more efficient form, similar examples of self-denial?

Dunant's efforts were furthered by the *Société d'Utilité publique* of Geneva, which at length issued circulars to the different governments of Europe inviting them to send delegates to a conference to be held at Geneva on the 26th of October 1863, "to consider the means of providing for the insufficiency of the Sanitary service of armies in the field." This conference was presided over by the veteran General Dufour of Switzerland. It discussed the practicability of employing voluntary aid for the succor of the wounded in battles, and that of declaring the wounded and all employed in attending to their wants as not subject to capture but entitled, under all circumstances, to military protection.

After many discussions, in some of which doubt was entertained whether a sanitary organization, based upon the voluntary efforts of the people were possible, the following recommendations were made:

1. Let the governments grant their highest protection to the committees of relief which shall be formed, and facilitate, as much as possible, the fulfilment of their mission.

2. Let *neutrality* be proclaimed in time of war, by belligerent

nations, for the ambulances and the hospitals, and let it be equally admitted in the most complete manner, for the personnel of the Sanitary staff, for the voluntary nurses, for the country people who may go to assist the wounded, and for the wounded themselves.

3. Let a uniform, distinctive badge be recognized for the Sanitary corps of all armies, or at least for the persons of the same army who are attached to that service; let a uniform flag be also adopted for ambulances and hospitals in all countries.

Another convention was proposed, at which duly authenticated representatives of the European governments should discuss the recommendations of the Genevan meeting of 1863. In the meantime* "the influence of the Sanitary Commission had extended beyond the borders of the United States. Public attention was aroused in Europe. In the German-Danish conflict Relief organizations, regularly organized on the precise model of those existing in America, rendered the greatest service. Her majesty the Queen of Prussia added the greatest lustre to her crown by the affectionate gratitude she merited from the wounded by visiting the hospitals of Schleswig and Holstein, and by the declaration she made when distributing relief to the victims of the two hostile armies: In this crisis, I do not speak or feel as a queen, but express my sympathy for suffering humanity as a woman."

On the eighth of August, 1864, the International Congress was held at Geneva, and a treaty was concluded the main features of which were ratified and approved by the principal governments of Europe. In brief, these were as follows: that ambulances should be recognized as neutral, and be protected and respected as such by the belligerents as long as they contained sick or wounded, but that their neutrality should cease if they were guarded by an armed force; that the *personnel* of hospitals and ambulances, comprising all persons engaged in their superintendence and government, in the care or transport of the wounded, as well as voluntary nurses (*aumoniers*)

* La Commission Sanitaire, par Evans. XIII.

should participate in the benefits of the neutrality so long as there might remain any wounded needing attention; that such persons might continue in the exercise of their functions even after capture or rejoin the armies to which they belonged, and when their work was done that they should be protected until they would reach the outposts of their armies; that the *materiel* of the hospitals left behind should be subject to the laws of war, and that the persons engaged therein should only have power to take away their private property, but that the *materiel* of the ambulances should be free from capture; that the inhabitants of the country, as well as volunteer hospital attendants or nurses, who should aid the wounded, should be respected and protected, and that every wounded soldier received and cared for in a house should serve as a safeguard to the same; that the sick or wounded soldier should be received and nursed regardless of his nationality; that a distinctive and uniform flag should be adopted for hospitals, ambulances, and convoys, which should always be accompanied by the national flag of the nation to which they belong; and that a distinct badge should be worn, on the left arm of all persons neutralized by this treaty, which should be delivered to them exclusively by the military authority. And then, as though it were an acknowledgment that such benevolent resolutions and determinations could only have existence through the benign influence of Christ, the flag and the badge were ordered to bear "*a red cross upon a white field*," which, we may hope, shall be seen on every battle-field as a silent protest against war, while it gives the protection of neutrality to every man who brings succor to its victims.

With the obligations of the Genevan treaty resting upon them, and the influence of our Sanitary Commission, let us see what was effected during the recent Austro-Prussian-Italian war. The book of Dr. Evans affords us an opportunity of examining the testimony of an eye-witness. He is an American surgeon-dentist, resident in Paris, who has acquired great wealth and much distinction from the practice of his profession abroad. During our civil war he investigated the operations

of the Sanitary Commission and published in Paris a report on the same, which was widely circulated on the Continent, communicating the results of our experience as to the sanitary reform needed in armies. This publication so connected his name with this kind of work, that he became favorably known to the continental governments, and received autograph letters of thanks from the Empress of the French, the Queen of Holland, the Emperor of Austria, the Queen of Prussia, and others. We shall quote freely from Dr. Evans last book, as from the most reliable source of information. He betook himself to the seat of war with the view of studying the European Sanitary organizations and of comparing them with those of America. He says; "By repairing to the theatre of events in order to better examine the questions which had occurred to me, I considered that I was fulfilling a duty, the more so because, before the war, their Majesties, the King and Queen of Prussia, had repeatedly expressed to me their unqualified sympathy with the work accomplished by the United States Sanitary Commission, and had deigned to encourage me in the efforts I was making to propagate in Europe the idea of a Sanitary enterprise, similar to that which in America had rendered such great services to humanity."

Prussia had a Central Prussian Relief Society formed in February, 1864, which entered into active service during the Schleswig-Holstein war, It was an anomaly and without precedent in the military history of Europe. Through the agency of two members of this body a depot had been organized at Flensburg, from which lint, bedding, instruments and alimentary supplies were furnished to the surgeons as they were needed. The army preparations were, however, nearly adequate to the demands of the war, with the exception of over-crowded hospitals which resulted in great mortality among the patients. The Relief Society appealed to the people to receive the wounded soldiers into their houses. "To this appeal the population responded with such eagerness that it was impossible for the society to accept all the offers made. From that moment overcrowding of the hospitals ceased, wounds healed more readily,

and the proportionate amount of mortality decreased considerably." It was believed that these results contributed greatly to the adoption of the Genevan treaty. After the close of the Schleswig campaign "the Society remained in active service with the view of preparing during peace the means of succoring the wounded, should war again break out."

Dr. Evans was struck with the presence of large numbers of hospital attendants at the railway stations. "They wore upon the arm the badge of the international society— the red cross upon a white ground. They were there awaiting each convoy, and ready to render assistance to whatever wounded soldiers, friends or enemies, the train might bring. I was reminded of the volunteer hospital attendants of the American Sanitary Commission, who also prepared at the stations "Refreshment Rooms" and "Homes" for the sick and wounded, returned from the fields of battle." There were, however, no female attendants, as there had always been, where practicable, in our country.

In April, 1866, the Prussian Society was incorporated by the King, and it was formally declared to be for the future the organ of public charity in the war. A stirring appeal was sent forth to the people by the society, urging a collection of resources, "so that if war breaks out we may be ready, with the blessing of God, to help our brothers, sons, relations and friends, who will go forth to defend the country." Local relief societies were formed on all sides, and these forwarded money or useful articles to the depot in Berlin. A Commissary-General and Inspector of the volunteer hospital service of the Prussian army—Count von Stollberg was appointed, who acquainted the Relief Society with the movements of the troops and the points where need was most urgent, and was a medium between the regular medical bureau and the society. The society was subject to the control of a central committee of twenty-four members, fifteen of whom were residents of Berlin.

The first place, where the benefit of the Prussian Relief Society was shown on a large scale, was Langensalza. An engagement was fought here June 28th, 1866, by a detachment of

Prussians against the Hanoverian forces which were on their way to effect a junction with the Bavarian troops. The resources of the Prussian army were insufficient to meet the wants of the wounded. Count von Stollberg received information at five o'clock in the afternoon that there were 1500 wounded at Langensalza, absolutely in want of bread. "Immediately, the central committee, with a most commendable activity, responded to the call; after midnight, three special convoys left the Berlin station, bearing the succors of the Sanitary Society upon the field of battle. * * * One of its members accompanied the expedition, as also eight physicians, and several male and female volunteer nurses, among whom were six deaconesses of the Institution of Protestant Sisters." At Gotha vehicles were furnished for transporting the supplies, so that they reached the place of want on the following morning. Here there were more than 1000 Hanoverians and 3000 Prussians wounded. Stromeyer, the famous German surgeon, was in charge with excellent assistants, but his force was inadequate to the demands. The arrival of the special supplies brought comfort and relief to the wounded, and the Sanitary flag was an ensign of joy to all.

This first effort of the Prussian Society was surpassed however by its exertions after the great battle of Sadowa, where it "proved in a splendid manner the great services a work based upon the free co-operation of a united people can render in these solemn moments." More than five hundred thousand soldiers were engaged in the fight of July 3rd, 1866. Over forty thousand wounded were left on the field. These were entirely in charge of the Prussian surgeons, who treated all the wounded alike, in conformity to the treaty of Geneva. "For three days and nights the Sanitary companies were exploring the battle-field in search of the wounded." Supplies having, however, been sent to Gitschin the day before the battle, they were at hand immediately as the need arose. These were followed in quick succession by convoys containing hospital supplies and even ice. Evans remarks: "what particularly struck me in the manner of acting of this society, was that, notwithstanding

the enthusiasm exclusively Prussian and patriotic, which animated every soul at this time, and conducted the Prussians to brilliant successes, it did not abjure an instant its international mission. It distributed its aid impartially to the children of Prussia and to their adversaries."

In addition to its labors on the field and in the hospital the Relief Society established grand *Buffets* at the principal railway stations, where agents furnished relief to the sick and wounded as they passed by. Meat, beef, soup, wine bread, coffee and cigars were among the articles furnished at these stations. Adopting another American idea—books and papers were procured in quantities for distribution among the hospitals, and among "the improvised libraries there was a large number of Italian, Hungarian and Sclavonian works; the sick and wounded of the Austrian army, nursed by Prussia, being much more numerous than the Prussian sick, and composed in part of Italians, Hungarians and Poles, it was determined that they should profit alike by the benefits of the measure adopted." Aid to the convalescent in the shape of money was also given, when the circumstances required it.

As in our own country during the war, there were other organizations, besides that which had a national character, in Prussia, whose members contributed successfully to the succoring of the wounded. The Knights of St. John—a Protestant order—were active throughout the war. They claim to be the direct continuators of the old order and devote themselves to the work of nursing sick and wounded soldiers. Count Stollberg was the Grand Master. The knights were generally at the same time delegates of the Relief Society, and were placed at the head of the depots, hospitals, &c., and, on account of their experience, were most useful in the prompt execution of all plans of relief. The Catholic Knights of Malta rivalled, in zeal and good works, the Knights of St. John. Then there were countless Relief Societies, Private Hospitals, Sisters of Charity, Catholic nuns, and Protestant Deaconesses, all devoting their energies to the task of aiding the physician, to restore to health those whose death seemed inevitable, or to render less painful the last hours of those visited by death.

In other parts of Germany also, the people were active in their efforts to secure contributions of money and articles necessary for the wounded. After the war had begun, Relief Societies were formed at Dresden, Leipsig, Chemnitz and Zittau in Saxony. "When the trains of wounded arrived at Dresden, such a number of women presented themselves at the hospitals, that the medical officers had to intervene and refuse them access; they brought their offerings pell-mell, moved by a noble sentiment of compassion, but without order and without discernment." Order was introduced into the volunteer work by the efforts of General von Reitzenstein, the President of the Relief Society. Under proper organization and control the money and articles, which were sent to Dresden from all parts of the kingdom, were judiciously and advantageously distributed. In Würtemberg the local societies were all auxiliary to a *Saniäts Verein* at Stuttgart, which was under the direct patronage of the Queen, who was the pioneer in the work of organizing plans of relief, and who personally stimulated the courage of the patients, in the hospitals, by her presence and words. The Sanitäts Verein not only furnished supplies, but forwarded male and female nurses to the hospitals at Tauberbischofsheim and the neighboring villages after the battles on the Mein. In Baden an organization of ladies, the *Badischer Frauen Verein* had been established in 1859 at Carlsruhe by the Grand Duchess, to meet the probable wants of a war then seemingly pending. Its central committee instituted, in 1861, "schools for the nurses to be employed in taking care of sick and wounded soldiers." These schools were attached to the hospitals of Carlsruhe, Pforzheim, and Mannheim. After a course of theoretical and practical instruction, under the medical officers, lasting for three months, the women attending undergo an examination and receive certificates setting forth their capacities. "When they have terminated their instruction, those who return home in the city or country, remain nevertheless under the direction of the local Sanitary committee. A part of the nurses stay in the hospitals where they perfect themselves. Lastly some are employed in an establishment at Carlsruhe,

founded by the Society, and nurse the sick at home gratuitously in time of peace." This *Frauen Verien* acted as one of the International Societies of Relief during the war. Their record of labor efficiently performed was a brilliant one. "They fulfilled their arduous duties to the full satisfaction of the physicians and the wounded, and succeeded in conquering the distrust which they encountered on their arrival upon the scene of action. Besides, the material service which they rendered, their excellent influence full of gentleness, the order which they knew how to organize in the small hospitals committed to their care, and the consolation which they diffused in the hearts of the suffering, show of what great importance it is that women, whose education places them above the ordinary level, should consecrate themselves to the care of hospitals." A similar result was obtained by the organization of women in Bavaria. Evans bears full testimony to the thorough manner in which the obligations of the Genevan Convention were fulfilled by these nations, all of whom had ratified the treaty of 1864.

In Italy the good effects of an adherence to the Genevan Treaty were perceived, from the opening of the war. Indeed, the Milanese Committee of the Italian Association of Relief for sick and wounded soldiers, was organized, before the adoption of the Treaty, as early as June 15, 1864. It appealed to the medical societies of Italy to form similar associations, which eventually recognized the Milanese Committee as the central committee, although in fact, when active operations began, Florence shared with Milan the honor of controling the general operations of the relief service. During the whole war the Italians are said to have shown remarkable zeal and activity. "The physicians distinguished themselves by their zeal and readiness to enlist under the glorious banner of the Society. During the days of Custozza, they were seen upon the field of battle succoring the wounded, and, faithful to the mission of the Society, attending Italians and Austrians indiscriminately. * * And here, as elsewhere, it was the women especially, who, by their courage, their energy and devotion, aided the Relief Society to do all that it accomplished."

Having glanced at what was done in and by nations that had ratified the Genevan Treaty, let us see how things were managed in Austria, which had refused to join in the ratification. The task imposed by the situation upon Austria was less arduous than that assumed by Prussia. The latter was called upon to provide not only for its own wounded, but for the large number of sick and wounded Austrians that fell into its hands. Its chief glory consisted in the execution of this task, "especially through the spontaneous and continued co-operation of its sanitary associations; and the force and grandeur of these institutions consisted in their having an *international* character, which enlisted their sympathies alike for friends and enemies." In Austria the sanitary service of the army was defective, and efforts were made by private associations to meet the defects, but "they were wanting in that co-operative character which was the glory of similar enterprizes organized in the United States and in Germany." The first sanitary association formed was the *Patriotischer Damenverein*, which had really been in operation during the Holstein war. This was under the Princess Scharzenberg, who gave up her palace, with all the buildings therewith connected, to the society, for hospital purposes. The Sisters of Charity officiated as nurses. The hospital of St. Francis was also superintended by ladies of the higher classes of society, working under the direction of the Baroness von Löwenthal. But the principal sanitary organization was the *Patriotic Society*, composed exclusively of men, which resembled the American organization, in having volunteer hospital corps prepared for duty in hospitals, at railway stations and wherever need seemed to exist. All classes of society were united in its membership, and showed great readiness in the performance of its work of philanthropy. One of the hospitals had been placed in charge of the *Damen Comitē*, and became noted from the small mortality that marked its records. Even when the cholera broke out in this establishment, two of these ladies remained at their posts, although many had been driven away by fear, and devoted themselves for several weeks to the business of cooking, and nursing three hundred persons.

The record of honest, well-meant efforts for the benefit of the suffering has been made by Austria as well as by the two other powers engaged in the short but exceedingly disastrous war. Its defects arose from the want of systematic co-operation, and Austria has recognized these by agreeing, since these events, to the Genevan Treaty.

Dr. Evans' testimony to the excellency of our sanitary exertions is very important, as he was an eye-witness of all he relates. He says: "If I were now asked what improvements I have been able to observe in Germany and Italy, upon the work instituted as early as 1861, in America, by the United States Sanitary Commission, I am compelled to acknowledge that I have nowhere seen a striking amelioration, an improvement worthy of being signalled, either in the organization of the materiel of the ambulances, or in the personal composition of the Sanitary Societies. I will even say, and I certainly speak without prejudice or partiality, that it is regrettable that the experience acquired in the United States, during four years of murderous war, was not turned to better profit; it is particularly lamentable that many of the excellent measures employed by the American Sanitary Commission were not adopted by the Relief Societies in Germany, and lastly, that a good number of American inventions appropriate to the service of ambulances were not employed by the different committees."

It is pleasant to present an outline of the humane efforts of men to relieve suffering during the prevalence of the scourge of war. There has been so much on the pages of past and present history of an opposite character, that the soul sickens at the recital. At times there have been notable instances of a recognition of the rights of the sick and wounded to kindness and attention, but even our so-called civilized nations have too often forgotten what was due to a prostrate foe. England, during her Indian war, and probably in the late sack of the Abyssinian Magdala, has blotted her escutcheon with many foul stains; while Mahometans, like the famous Saladin, who allowed the Chevaliers of St. John to operate with the wounded after he had conquered Jerusalem, have at times won imperishable credit for their considerate care of conquered enemies.

The Christian Church has shown its practical recognition of the peaceful mission conferred by the divine Master, in all the humane operations that have brightened the pages of war. Its members have not hesitated to work with those who have banded themselves together for sanitary service, being instant in their labors for the comfort of the bodies and the salvation of the souls of the suffering. Were it free from divisions and bound together by the cords of unity that should encompass it, all such organizations would arise from *its* midst. The noble, self-denial and sufferings of Deaconesses, Sisters of Charity, and countless other societies belonging alone to its members, bear testimony to what the religion of Christ can do when its members are actuated by its spirit of love. But, until the Millennial period of unity shall come, we must not despise the efforts of any organization formed for philanthropic ends. It is the Christian's duty to aid these as far as may be in his power; to work assiduously in their ranks, striving to give them as much of a religious character as possible. They must be cherished and fostered because of the good they endeavor to accomplish. All this need not interfere with the prayerful recognition of the Church as the proper source through which benevolence and philanthropy flow as so many forms of that Christian charity, which bears as its motto: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth the rain on the just and on the unjust.

ART. VI.—CONDITIONS OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP.*

BY REV. E. V. GERHART, D.D.

Youth bears the closest relation to manhood. The one grows out of and depends upon the other. This we all admit, though young men generally do not feel the full force of the truth. The relation comprehends the entire constitution, physical, intellectual, and moral.

This fact imparts special importance and solemnity to your college course. It exerts a determining influence, for good or evil, on the whole of your future life, upon your intelligence and scholarship, your character and conduct, your position in society; and it even reaches out into eternity.

The result of your college education, whatever it may be, is the product mainly of two factors. The one is the *Teacher*, the other the *Student*, or the *Master* and the *Disciple*. The one is the ability and fidelity of the Faculty of instruction, the other the diligence and moral earnestness of the student. As this subject, the relation of Master and Disciple, was handled very clearly and forcibly by the President of the College in his opening address, nearly two years ago, it is not my intention nor is there any occasion, to take it up at this time. What I propose to say now will be rather a further development and application of the same general idea.

I propose to consider some of *the essential conditions of success on the part of the student.*

Punctuality, regular attendance, close application to study, thorough preparation of every lesson, attention in the class-room, and a lively interest in knowledge for its own sake, are

* An address to the Students of Franklin and Marshall College, delivered April 16th, 1868. Published by request.

of primary importance. These things come first. Without them nothing, or but very little comparatively, can be accomplished. These conditions lie at the threshold of education and scholarship. No degree of ability, fidelity and efficiency of a teacher can compensate for the want of interest and devotion on the part of the student.

These conditions lie on the surface, as it were; every one can see them with half an eye. There are some others, however, that lie deeper, and are therefore more necessary still, in order that a good College may accomplish the work which it proposes to itself, and that the diligence and lively interest of a student may not issue in a failure.

A young man must pursue his College course in a spirit, and with a purpose, which are in harmony with the idea of the College, and the end which it proposes to itself.

The different parts of a College curriculum are not separate. They are not brought together mechanically, but they sustain an internal relation to each other—each one to all the rest. Mutually interdependent, they are animated, or at least ought to be animated, by one principle; each one performs a function peculiar to itself and is related to an end which is common to all.

These parts may therefore be called branches, because they are so many living forces working together toward one common end. Making the most general distinction, we may divide them into *formal* and *material*. The *formal* are chiefly Mathematics and Logic. Mathematics is ideal and metaphysical. It is the pure product of thought in one particular sphere. It begins with the general idea of *quantity*. Then passing from the idea to its postulates, which are called axioms and by which all mathematical processes are governed, the science unfolds this idea according to the laws of thought. Mathematics is the result of a logical process in the sphere of ideal quantity.

Matter and mind being but different members of one whole, the powers and forces of nature correspond to the categories and laws of thought. Indeed the unseen, all comprehending forces of nature, and the laws of the human mind are in their last

ground, not indeed identical, but yet *one*. Both forms of being embody and express the thought and will of the Logos, which is the free creating principle of matter and spirit alike.

This profound truth, which is both Christian and metaphysical, underlies and sustains the application of the formal truths of mathematics to the sensible objects of the natural world. Possessing an intuitive sense of the oneness of matter and mind, and of the correspondence of the intention and fixed forces of matter with the generic forms and laws of thought,—though few persons stop to reflect upon this principle, and many are even disposed to deny it when it is affirmed,—we proceed by a spontaneous action of the mind and without reflection to investigate nature, and construct the various natural sciences in obedience to the formal truths of pure mathematics. Natural Science is the product of mind investigating and reflecting upon the material world according to forms and laws of thought which are unfolded from itself and certified in consciousness.

The formal science of Logic is not limited to the idea of quantity, but is general. Logic unfolds all the categories of thought and all the laws of thought. Hence it is the plastic power of all scientific inquiry and all scientific results, in the sphere of matter and mind. Geology and astronomy, anatomy and physiology, psychology and philosophy, ethics and aesthetics, and theology in all its departments;—all derive their scientific character from logical thinking.

The study of both logic and mathematics possesses great value as a discipline of the mind—of the thinking and reasoning powers. But to devote yourself to either one for this end only, to make either one its own end absolutely, involves a perversion of the great design of the College. For though each one is its own end, it is such however only relatively. The ultimate purpose lies beyond. These formal sciences are subordinate to practical life, to history, and to the material sciences: but subordinate to these interests as they themselves in turn are by faith made subordinate and subservient to the true ultimate end of man and of creation, which is no other than the Logos Himself. The original ground and the ultimate absolute end both of all existence and of all scientific knowledge, are one and the same.

The *material* sciences are those which deal with real objects. These are the various subdivisions of nature; then man himself as to body, soul and spirit; and finally God, and the reciprocal relation of God and man. Thus we get the various sciences of nature, the various sciences terminating on man, and the various sciences terminating on God and the revelation of Himself in the person of Christ.

The various material sciences are not co-ordinate nor externally associated. They are organized. Each one holds a place and performs a function relatively to all the rest, and relatively to the end of all. They take rank, each one according to the relative position of its corresponding object. The mineral is lower than the plant, and subordinate to it. The plant is lower than the animal, and subordinate to it. So is the animal, related to man. The mineral and the plant are both taken up in, and condition the existence of the animal. So do these three lower kingdoms condition the idea and existence of man as he takes them up into himself. Man finally, being lower than God, finds his end in Him, and in Him alone. But God becomes an object of knowledge and will, truly, only as being present and related to faith in the Person of Christ. And Christ is real and true for faith only when acknowledged as the head of His kingdom, and present in it.

This order of the objects of knowledge determines the relative position and order of the corresponding sciences. The lowest object of thought determines the lowest science; and the highest object of thought determines the highest science. The intermediate objects determine the position and relative importance of the intermediate sciences. The sciences standing lowest on the scale are related to the highest not directly, but only through those which are intermediate. All the sciences, for example, that deal directly with inorganic matter, or lifeless objects, are lowest on the scale, such, for example, as mineralogy and geology. This judgment, however, does not imply that they are unimportant, or unworthy of the attention of the greatest minds. By no means. But we mean that their relation to the highest, in the providence of God, is mediated

by all the other sciences, and chiefly by metaphysics, including psychology, logic and philosophy in general; and most of all is the relation mediated and conditioned by a true idea of God, as Creator and Father.

Hence we must reason from the earth to God, not directly, but through the medium of animated nature, and, above all, through the constitution of man. The objective relation of the earth to God is concrete, not abstract. Therefore must the science of the earth stand in a concrete relation to the knowledge of God; that is, it is valid only in as far as it is organically connected with zoology, psychology and theology. An attempt to draw an inference from the present constitution of the rocks, or from any geological facts, abstracted from their internal relation to all other kingdoms and forces of the universe, directly to God and to the divine acts of creation and redemption, is in the highest degree one-sided, arbitrary and superficial, and must be false necessarily. As well might a philosopher infer the nature of human personality directly from the anatomy of his big toe.

Taking this view of the various branches of your College course, you see that their relation to one another and the design of prosecuting them is grounded in the Christian idea of God. This idea gives position, spirit, character, force and purpose to every study, to Mathematics and Logic, to Mineralogy and Botany, to Greek and Latin, no less than to Philosophy, History and Ethics; assigning to each one a function corresponding to its objective location. Now, it is an important condition of success that you prosecute your studies in harmony with the genius of the Institution—in harmony with the relation which every study bears to its fundamental idea and ultimate purpose. You must not only read and think—not only learn your lessons like boys, and recite perfectly, which is something however which I hold to be of primary importance, but you must stand in a true ethical relation to every study, and to the ultimate end of the whole College course; otherwise you will contradict the College. You may be punctual, regular, diligent and gentlemanly, and yet from the time you enter the Freshman Class until your Commencement day, you may be waging war against true scientific

knowledge. Whilst each study claims to be pursued in its own spirit and for its own purpose, you may pursue it in a foreign spirit, and for a purpose for which it does not exist. You seem to be in the right place and have on the harness, but, like Saul of Tarsus, you kick against the pricks; and you fail to attain to that kind of thorough scholarship which the College is striving to promote.

A second condition of success is that *the student, by his own act, reproduce for himself the knowledge which he acquires.* This point, for want of time, I will consider but briefly. In the address to which I have already referred, this subject was fully discussed.

Dr. Rauch used to say that the human mind was not a wall into which he could strike a nail and then hang science and knowledge upon it like a coat. Scholarship, and particularly Christian scholarship, is not traditional. The teacher cannot hand over a science to a student, as the bookseller hands a book to a purchaser. Nor does a student possess any such receptive capacity. He may learn the text-book by heart. He may commit all the parts of a science, and all definitions of science to memory. He may be able to answer all questions accurately, answers to which he has learned from the text book and the Professor. But if he does no more, he cannot become a thinking man, not a scholar. He is only a pack-horse loaded with other men's wares. His knowledge is like undigested potatoes in his stomach. He is a slave in the Republic of scholarship and letters, not a freeman. But unlike the negro, the Professor can't knock off his shackles; that he must do himself. He must work himself up into freedom and the rights of citizenship, and all the masters of science will bid him God-speed.

A student must be active; not simply passive. He must take up the subject for himself, and in his own way, using the book and the instruction of the Class-room as a guide, help and support. He must penetrate the science, apprehend its principle as it is in itself and in its relations, cultivate the principle in the depths of his mind, and thus create anew in himself the whole structure of the science. Then knowledge becomes internal,

then the ideas of other men are taken up into, and become a part of yourself. Like the food you eat, they are freely digested, and turned into the flesh and blood of your spiritual being. Then you become a freeman. The knowledge acquired does not lie heavy on your mental stomach; but it is refreshing and invigorating; and you will become stronger and freer the longer you study and the more knowledge you acquire.

Of course we do not mean that every young man can thus be perfectly reproductive during his College course. But here is the place where he must make the beginning, and cultivate the true spirit and method of study. Then he may expect afterwards to mature his new creating power. But if he is content to pass through College in a traditional spirit, satisfied simply with receiving and holding what the College teaches, but not by the creative energy of his own reason, striving to produce it anew for himself, then his College career will be in a great measure a failure. He is likely to graduate an intellectual dyspeptic; and the undigested food of learning and science may give him pain, and make him irritable as long as he lives; or like an ox, turned into a clover field for the first time in the spring of the year, that eats more clover than he digests, his personal dignity is wonderfully inflated, and he is in great danger of bursting.

The last condition I propose to mention is, that a student must reproduce scientific knowledge for himself, not only *positively but also negatively, and in its principal negative relations.* This condition I regard as both necessary and in the highest degree important.

By reproducing scientific truth negatively, I mean that a young man who wishes to become a thorough, sound, and firm Christian scholar, is required to recognize the full force of the principal false divergent tendencies of science, meet them, acknowledge the truth which they involve, and then overcome them radically. In other words, every truth, every valid science, and the principle of every science, has its *cognate errors.* They are not imported. They proceed from the study of truth itself; they grow forth from it like fungi from a tree. No error is pure error, no heresy is pure heresy, no false system of philosophy

or religion, is unmixed falsehood. We may call error an abnormal development of truth, or a false tendency of truth. It is conditioned by the presence of sin in the world, which is a divisive, disorganizing force in mind and matter, and poisons every relation and sphere of human life. This evil force is radical. Sin lies at, and in the tap-root. Sin is a principle in the germ of the egg, and is hatched with the living being, and in it. It is hatched with a true system of science, and in it. Like life, it works from within, outwardly. It works silently and unconsciously. It works at all times, and in all persons, and in all spheres of human life. It works under the garb of truth, and logic. Like the devil, whose child it is, sin clothes itself in a garment of light.

It follows that in order to know the truth thoroughly, and be confirmed in the faith and knowledge of it, we must know not only what the truth is, but we must know also what the truth is not. We must know positively and negatively. We must be able to affirm, and to deny, concerning truth. Passing though such a dialetic process, a student becomes firm, as well as thorough. Hence every student who hopes to become a Christian scholar, a comprehensive and stable thinker, must pass through a period of temptation. Not that it is necessary to fall into error and for a time embrace falsehood for truth. But it is necessary to become acquainted with error, recognize the truth which underlies it, and appreciate properly its apparent claims to regard.

Sin being a general principle and a concrete power, temptation is for mankind a general necessity. It is a *necessity*, and the necessity is *general*. The *fall* of Adam was not unavoidable and necessary, but the temptation to sin was. Though created good and righteous, he had not only to choose the good, but to choose the good in opposition to the evil—God in opposition to Satan. To do this he possessed the requisite capacity. But in the exercise of his freedom, he mysteriously determined himself by the evil instead of the good, and thus fell under the bondage of a foreign power. So was the temptation of our blessed Saviour, the second Adam, a necessity, in order that he

might become perfect in righteousness. Being a true man he had not only to do the will of his Heavenly Father, but to do it also in opposition to the will of Satan. Therefore the principle of evil had really to confront Him, under some form, in the person of Satan; and he had to enter into a conflict, terrible and real. In the exercise of his freedom, He, unlike the first Adam, determined himself according to the will of God, and against the will of Satan. Thus on the one hand he resisted Satan and overcome him, and on the other he became stronger and more perfect in righteousness and holiness.

The same principle is applicable to all persons. Every young man must be tempted of evil. I do not say that it is necessary to do wrong; God forbid! But he must see and feel the force of evil, under one form or another, in order that he may say *no*, emphatically, and repudiate it. For he becomes moral by a two-fold act of his own will; he chooses the good against the demands of the evil, and he resists temptation in the strength of the good. He has to repeat in his own life the great conflict of Christ with Satan in the wilderness. Then, he becomes firm and strong, as well as good.

Now what is true of the will and moral conduct, is equally true of reason and thought. As there are tendencies and temptations to wrong-doing, so there are tendencies and temptations to false thinking. Both are unavoidable. You cannot escape them. They must be met. They cannot be ignored. You cannot, for example, say, I will have nothing to do with the false system of pantheism, or dualism. They are exploded. I will study only a sound system of philosophy and true science; that is sufficient for me; for I must live by truth and not by error So you may think. But if you do think so, you deceive yourself. True, dualism has been exploded many times over, but do not forget one thing; you have not yet exploded it, and therefore, is not for you an exploded system.

Your father, has successfully resisted the temptations to immorality, which confronted him in his youth. His moral victory, and moral character, secure to you inestimable advantage, but he cannot transmit his moral character to you. You must

pass through a conflict similar in kind to that through which he passed. You must acquire your character for yourself, and the conflict may be even more severe than his was.

Now, the relation in which you stand to your teacher, educationally, is analogous to the relation in which you stand, morally, to your father. No one can bequeath to you directly the benefit of his intellectual and scientific victory. Those thinkers who have exploded dualism, have done it for themselves, not for you. What they have written and said, may render you important assistance. It may be ten times easier for you to surmount this false system than if these profound and correct thinkers had not lived before you; but the victory achieved by others does not supersede the necessity of achieving the same victory for yourself. You must lay hold of the false system, study it, see the truth which underlies it, discriminate between the true and the false, and thus overcome the system in its principle. You must do for yourself, in your own way, what they have done for themselves in their way; otherwise you may ignore a false system, and even denounce it as absurd, and yet at the same time stand under the power of the very principle which underlies the system. You may denounce rationalism from the rationalistic stand-point of observation. You may denounce gnosticism in many of its forms, yet be a gnostic yourself. This fact has been illustrated times without number in the history of individuals and of communities. And there is no possible escape from this contradiction, unless you go to work in earnest, and digest and reproduce truth for yourself, under its negative aspect and in its negative relations, as well as in its positive aspects. I lay special emphasis on this condition of thorough and successful Christian scholarship. As you can come into full possession of truth, only by entering into the truth and embracing it in virtue of your own rational activity, so you can be delivered from the power of error only by appreciating error properly, and in the light and strength of truth, thinking it out logically as error for yourself. Then you may know the truth positively and negatively. You may know what is truth, and what is not truth. When you have come to occupy this position,

you will be confirmed in faith, and scientific knowledge, and sound philosophy, and true Christianity. Your house will stand on a rock; the winds may blow upon it, and the rushing waters dash against it, but it will not fall.

Perhaps some of you, conceding what I have said, may now raise the question in your own minds; If it be necessary to reproduce truth both positively and negatively, each one for himself, how can the mass of good people, who have no liberal education, stand firm in the faith and knowledge of the truth? since they have neither the inclination, nor the time, nor the ability, to engage in philosophical inquiries. This question is in place, but it offers no difficulty.

The necessity of reproducing and overcoming systems of error, does not pertain to men in general. It pertains only to thinking men, to students and scholars. All men think, but they do not make thinking an object of thought. All men stand in a system of philosophy, but they are not all conscious of the system in which they stand. Your position is a different one. You propose to acquire a liberal education. You propose to become thinking men. Therefore you are bound to meet the obligations of thinking men. So soon as a man begins to think, he is by the very act under the power of strong tendencies to error, for these tendencies are latent in the human reason, and are developed with reflection and thought. Little infants are innocent. They do no wrong. But so soon as they begin to desire, to will, and to act, the disposition to wrong-doing shows itself; and the parent is required to command one thing and to prohibit another. So too with conscious thought. So long as we do not think philosophically, we are not exposed to the danger of holding any false system consciously. But whenever we rise into the sphere of conscious reflection, the inherent tendencies to error make themselves felt. Then we are either carried away by the current of these false tendencies, or we must appreciate, master, and overcome them. Medicine is the profession of physicians. Law the profession of the jurist. Each one must be qualified to meet the demands of his own profession, or fail miserably. But to think correctly, to mould

the thinking of the community in general, to guide the people in the way of truth, and deliver them from the power of error, is the high and noble vocation of students and scholars. Hence it is they particularly, who are required to meet all the important conditions, positive and negative, of sound Christian scholarship.

The discussion of this subject suggests several practical inferences. But I will mention only one.

The most important element of a student, and of successful scholarship, is the *ethical* element. It is a matter of fundamental importance that you be *predisposed* in favor of what is right and true. Truth and error are mutually exclusive. There is no neutral ground. You cannot be indifferent. You cannot serve two masters. You will be a *priori* in sympathy with the one or the other. And if you be predisposed in favor of unbelief and error, you are in great measure disqualified for appreciating and receiving the truth, whether in the sphere of philosophy, morals or religion. For you cannot judge of truth from the stand-point of error. The opposite you can do. Of error you can judge from the stand-point of truth; just as you judge of the wrong in the light of what is right. But to judge of truth you must first enter into its own sphere in the spirit of faith. God is before Satan, and is the negative condition of his diabolical character. The good is older than the evil. Faith goes before unbelief. Unbelief is only a perverted unfolding of the principle of faith. See to it then that you possess an earnest moral purpose; that you cultivate the desire to be delivered from the bondage of sin and error, and to rise into the light of truth; and that you are always in sincere sympathy with what is good. See to it that your heart and will are in a right posture relatively to Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God.

ART. VII.—THE FAITH OF CHRIST.

BY REV. GEO. B. RUSSELL. A. M.

Jesus Christ is the Fontal Source of life, light, grace, truth. faith, and of our whole redemption. He is the life of the world, This life, becomes the light of men (John i. 4). Grace and truth came by Him (John i. 17) to our lost race. He is also, the Beginner and Finisher of our faith (Heb. xii. 2); so that we now may have righteousness by faith (Rom. iv. 10); and therefore also, being justified by faith (Rom. v. 1), we have peace with God. He is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and complete redemption (1 Cor. i. 30).

As the opened fountain of eternal life (John xiv. 6, viii. 37), we are accustomed to hear men own that He is also become the resurrection power (John xi. 25), bringing immortality to our dying race (2 Tim. i. 10); so that even though we die, yet shall we live. The fountain too, of divine love, He is commonly acknowledged, in some sense, to be by almost all Christians. The *love* of God, shed abroad in the Christian's heart is readily referred to its fountain head, Jesus Christ, who was given as the expression of Divine love for fallen man, lost in sin and doomed to unending misery and woe.

But when it is claimed for *faith*, that the same analogous relation holds between God and man, as that existing between Him and us in the mutual bond of *love*, there is not the same ready acknowledgment of the force of the truth. The common notion, which does not hesitate to own that love has a divine origin and source, is prone to refer faith to the merely human, rather than to the divine-human life as its primal ground and power. Its ground and origin is thought to be only in man's soul, rather than primarily in the life of Christ; and its outgrowth and exercise is therefore commonly regarded only in the

sphere of the human, rather than the divine-human, first in the person of Christ and then only, and because of that, in the life of His disciples.

It will of course be said that faith is a gift of God; but so also, are health and strength, vision and hearing, speech and reason. Faith must therefore come from God in a sense more directly related to the divine and supernatunal, than any of these merely natural endowments bestowed by our Creator on man. So that whatever faith is, in its first ground and source, as well as in its human exercise as a principle condition of our Christian religion; there will be found to be something vastly more than the common popular notion holds it to be, for a large part at least of our modern Protestant theological thinking.

Justification by Faith is of course generally admitted to be the most cardinal doctrine of Protestantism. But, if its importance is to be maintained, there must be a more correct sense of what is meant by faith itself, as the justifying principle, than that which attaches to the popular notion and is now so prevalent. With many, it is the merest fiction; with others, it is sometimes altogether notional; and with others, still, it is only an exercise of human thought, which by some rational process produces what they are pleased to call faith. Then again, it is made to mean, from another view, a crass Pelagian power working from the human will outwardly towards God; and so, being itself the Saviour, an autonomic saving power, instead of being the supernatural bond between man and our only Saviour Jesus Christ.

Accordingly, it is too often found that those who prate most vaporingly of what is thus popularly denominated "Justification by faith," are just those who are most exposed to the danger of falling away from the true ground of justification altogether. Not those, we read, who cry most, "Lord, Lord!" shall be owned by the heavenly Bridegroom—but they who do the will of God. As without faith, it is impossible to please Him; so must we find faith in its true ground, and thence receive it, if we would enjoy its saving benefits. If those who have the truth, hold it in unrighteousness, even they will be called into judgment.

WHAT THEN IS FAITH?

Its fundamental importance is sufficient apology for pressing the question. It has indeed been answered from various standpoints; but each one has its own peculiar aspect, and so the the answers are manifold.

Paul tells us (Heb. xi. 1) that faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. This, in the mechanical mode of thinking, so common in our day, may seem at first, all plain enough. Just here is, however, the greatest danger of taking a wrong bearing; and so, failing to apprehend the cardinal truth of "the substance" itself, and of "the evidence" authenticating the real, yet unseen verities.

Faith, moreover, or the grace reached by it, is *the gift of God* according to the same authority (Eph. ii. 8). Evidently the Apostle here includes all its contents. Jesus also, had already said to the woman of Samaria, "If thou knewest the *gift of God*, and who it is that saith unto thee," &c. (John iv. 10), she would have asked of Him, and He would have given unto her the *living water*. And when she then asked it, He gave her *faith*, and she immediately afterwards believed on Him. In the same sense, Paul calls the gift of God, eternal life through Jesus (Rom. vi. 23). And he thanks God for His unspeakable gift (2 Cor. ix. 15).

Now it is at once apparent, that there is a great deal more, in this view of faith, than is commonly received from the popular notion of what is meant by faith. The same kind of deeper meaning is found also in the apostle's reference to the converting and regenerating power of the *word* of God, where it means not only the gospel message, but the personal Word, the living incarnate truth, which many make to be nothing more than the letter of the Bible. So, indeed, with too many, faith is little if anything more than mere mechanical notion. Something that sets upon them by common habit or general traditional authority, blindly running into the common notion of the times or country in which they happen to live, is for them faith. Or, it may rise to a kind of self-adjusted reason, the

opinion or judgment formed by reflection and careful thought; but this, in the end, comes after all to land in sheer rationalism. In others, it may take the form of personal belief; or a well settled determination to hold for truth so much, and reject all else in the form of self-will, or by necessity of conviction from certain premises; as the devils are said to believe, *without having faith.*

There are others who have put for faith only the natural imaginations of galvanized fancy, clothing certain elements with æsthetic powers to create in them emotional and ideal life. Nearly allied to this, is the blind superstition of those who take every thing in nature to be divine signs and wonders. Thus, blind fate and bound authority, superstition and the tyranny of popular opinion run madly together. Fancy, notion and belief; imagination, reason and judgment on evidence; fiction, thought and conviction; these, either separately or taken together, are commonly regarded as the elements of faith, yet they can never reach its true ground. All that is of course only mere nature, and cannot ever rise higher than its own source.

Transcending all these natural powers of the human soul, FAITH yet rests really in man's nature as a supernatural endowment, a divine-human power. It follows, therefore, that no man can *think* himself into faith by any degree of logical reasoning. No amount of fancy can produce it. No exercise of human will can awaken it in man; and no settled conviction as belief, can bring it to pass. No multiplied force of blind, notional consent to the general authority of history, can generate faith. Circumstantial combination of all man's natural attributes cannot elevate his soul to the sphere of faith. In fine, mere human nature, though it has a capacity for faith, a receptivity for its supernatural power, yet could never awaken or beget faith in man's soul.

It is plain, however, from the most superficial observation that in some one of the natural human powers, or in the more or less full combination of all them, do men, for the most part, find what they commonly call faith.

Not as a man credits the authenticated facts of history does

he hold the contents of faith, as divine truth. The truths of history, or science may be believed: so too the records of the Bible, in the same natural way, without saving effect. But that is not faith. The contents of faith are also believed; but faith is much more than belief. The judgment arising from reasoning on the logical relations of truths, gives opinion; but faith is vastly more than opinion.

Christian consent even has not always however been well settled in the general mind, as to the true principle and ground of faith. Because there is indeed a "mystery of faith," it cannot be measured rationally. It must be determined by its own principle. For us, it must always exist in such way, as that we may be able to apprehend its supernatural contents, on its own plane, and in its own sphere, in its own proper element, and by its own organ; and this can be done only in its own order, when once we have been apprehended first by it and endowed with its own wondrous power (Phil. iii. 12). When once we have begun to live only after that, sooner or later, can we come to know something of life. If we see, we can have a more clear idea of light and vision, than the man who has always been blind.

So, faith being a gift of God, when it "has come" into the soul, endows it with divine-human power, and gives it the miraculous capacity of taking firm hold of the supernatural. When once made "wise through faith in Christ," we can then come into right apprehension of Christian truth—not outside and beyond it first. Then can we be brought to "understand that the worlds were made;" and that "without faith it is impossible to please God." To become "obedient to the faith," is to give our hearty consent and submision to its authority, and an unwavering obedience to its demands. To "have faith in God," is first to have Christ's life formed within us, and then to submit our whole being to His rulings in our behalf, with a freedom that makes our will coincide at all points with His.

Present evidence of the unseen, and thus the real substance of the hoped for future good, the verities of grace authenticated to an organ higher than human reason, or will, or feelings; a

bond uniting our fallen nature to the life of God's dear Son—this in us, is faith. Having this supernatural power of "an endless life," it can now truly be said of such an one, "thy faith hath saved thee." With this heavenly gift, even though it be small in quantity or weak in degree, yet has it the divine assurance that "according to thy faith, so shall it be done unto thee." All this however comes first from THE FAITH OF CHRIST.

THE FAITH OF CHRIST IS THE JUSTIFYING PRINCIPLE.

Faith in the human soul, as the justifying principle, (Rom. v. 1), comes as the gift of God from its primary source, "the faith of Christ." This is not one with the common expression, "faith *in* Christ." That indeed is requisite; but in order to it, there must be first *The Faith of Christ*—not the system of Christian doctrine, or a history of recorded facts, as in the Bible; but the faith of Christ as that ruled in His own life. By the very proneness to make "the faith of Christ" to be equal only to faith *in* Him, we are admonished that we cannot be too careful as to how we hold the great truth of justification by faith. There is no more real justifying merit in the mere *act of believing*, or exercising faith towards Christ, than in any other human effort at work-righteousness. No such moral act is efficacious to this end. Only "Christ is the end of the law *for* righteousness, to every one that believeth" (Rom. x. 4). We must indeed exercise faith in the Lord Jesus, when God has bestowed that grace upon us, and commands us to believe the gospel.

Christ's obedience to the law of God is our only righteousness; even "that which is through *the faith* of Christ," (Phil. iii. 9.) "The righteousness of God, which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them that believe," (Rom. iii. 22,) is, for us, the full release, in faith (which holds in the unity of our life with His life) from the condemnation of the law. The faith of Christ, therefore, is that heavenly grace, that divine gift, that supernatural power, by which we are enabled to look to Christ, and come to Him for salvation; and also, by which we apprehend the fact of our real justification in Him, and by which we come more and more to know and finally to enjoy the bless-

edness of our redemption. To this end Jesus sent Paul to the Gentiles; "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by *faith that is in Me*" (Acts xxvi. 18). From Him comes all objective faith. Thence if we receive it, we can exercise it toward Him, and so believe in Him.

In proportion as this is subjectively a more or less conscious part of our life, may we be said to have "little faith," or "great faith." The beginnings of faith may be weak and small; and we may with the holy apostles need to pray, "Lord increase our faith;" but if it be true and genuine, though comparatively only as a "grain of mustard seed" (Luke xvii. 6), yet has it most miraculous power. Once implanted in the soul by the power of God, it becomes the ruling principle of a new and endless life. Exercised as a divine-human power, it rules in the lives of all the saints.

Therefore they of old, though not having received the things promised, yet "embraced them and confessed" themselves under their power; "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens" (Heb. xi. 33, 34).

Saints are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," says St. Peter (1 Eph. i. 5); and he further addresses them as "receiving the *end* of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (1 Pet. i. 9). They who do believe in God that raised Christ up from the dead and gave Him glory, the same Apostle tells us, have this grace, "that your faith and hope might be in God." St. Paul declares that the life I now live, I live by *the faith of the Son of God*" (Gal. ii. 20). So he also reminds them that they "are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7–26). Not by dead form, but by a living power, is this made to hold; "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith" (Gal. v. 5).

The form of the law or the lack of it availeth not; "but faith which worketh by love," is the availing power to justify the sinner (Gal. iii. 24).

Evidently this justification is by apprehending Christ in His whole divine-human life; and it is therefore not a mere fiction without any background of reality in the life of our Redeemer. Neither is it only a mere notion or thought simply in man, but something actually wrought by the faith of Christ. It must be more than vain fancy or imagination on the part of man.

Merely to feel one's self righteous is not to make it so, in fact Nor to only think one's self righteous before God, is it after all, anything more than a vain thought.

If now, we are to be saved, we must have a righteousness that is a real part of us. We must have, therefore, in personal possession a righteousness, exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees—else we cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Not merely by some legal fiction, does God allow us to escape the penalties of His violated law. He cannot in truth declare us to be righteous and justified, when in fact, we have no sufficient righteousness to justify us; or, when it only exists in another, and holds no real relation to ourselves.

Nay: in order that God be just and yet the Justifier of them that believe, there must be in the person of the believer the real "righteousness of God, which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them that believe" (Rom. iii. 22). They that are justified, are made just "freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (v. 24). In Him, we are justified by the faith of Christ. Thus it is that God, giving us the Holy Ghost, purifies the heart, (Acts xv. 9.)

Of all human endowments, the most comprehensive and the most absolutely real, is that which apprehends the supernatural, which is Faith. Only by this divine-human power we, believing in Christ, can obey God. This enables us to exercise "repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," (Acts xx. 21.) By this, we overcome the world, remain steadfast, fight the good fight of faith, and find it possible to please God. It is the *re-li-ga-re*, the rebonding of man with God, in

the power of an endless life. It is the essential element in the Christian religion.

In man's soul, the justifying principle must finally be lodged. The faith OF Christ is given *to* man; and man then has faith IN Christ. What justifies, is not the faith *of* man *in* Christ, so much as the faith of Christ, as the broad objective ground, out of which man's faith springs.

The justfying principle is then, not the subjective act of man's soul in exercising faith, by believing in Christ, but the principle of faith, with its divine-human contents in the Person of the God-man, made over to the human soul. Justification by faith, is that real making of man righteous and just before God, in the only and whole merits of Christ, "by the faith OF Him."

By a real union, mystically holding between Christ and believers, the righteousness of our Lord Jesus passes over to the true disciple, who is also a vitalized member, united to the Divine-human life of our Redeemer, like as the living branch is joined to the common life of the vine. Thus, we obtain in personal and real possession, "the righteousness of God, which is by the faith OF Jesus Christ." Only this can justify; and therefore only thus, can we be justified by faith. All other notions, or opinions, or fancies, or beliefs, however respectable in themselves, are the merest fictions and phantoms, imaginary and vain.

Man must have faith, before he can believe: just as he must have organs of speech, before he can speak; just as he must have an eye with all its functions complete, before he can see. So faith, the eye of the soul, is the organ for apprehending spiritual truth. The ability to apprehend divine truth savingly, is bestowed upon us, as the gift of God; by which, in the primal order of the supernatural, joining the human and divine in one, in "the faith of the Son of God," (Gal. ii. 20), we have been first apprehended. The carnal mind cannot perceive the things of the Spirit, for they must be spiritually discerned. So the revelation of grace is only for faith; and this holds in the order of the new creation, which is in Christ Jesus. In Him,

"we have access by faith unto this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God." (Rom. v. 2.) It anchors the soul to God.

From what has now been seen, it is plain that the general sense of the Holy Scriptures in the minds of the inspired Apostles, refers all the value of faith to Christ. This may in some popular sense be readily admitted; but it holds true, in a far deeper and higher sense, than is commonly confessed, when men speak of the value of faith. Man's faith is only efficacious, when it is of the same kind with Christ's faith.

We are thus brought near to the ground principle of Faith. Its objective and fontal source is evidently in the person of Christ. Its divine power holds therefore in the life of Jesus. The Scriptures which speak of His faith, the faith of the Son of God, the faith of Christ, and the faith of God, all refer broadly to the Personal Faith of Jesus' own life; rather than to some act of man going out towards Him.

CHRIST HIMSELF FIRST HAS DIVINE-HUMAN, PERSONAL FAITH; AND THEREFORE, HIS DISCIPLES CAN HAVE FAITH, AND BELIEVE IN HIM.

He is the Head, in every sense, of all believers. He has life in Himself, and therefore we have life, holding in one with Him. Our redemption holds, in all the stages of our humanity, in the fulness of His divine-human nature. He is Captain of our salvation. He is the source of our righteousness, having fully kept the law, and put honor upon it for us. He is the fullness of of our obedience, having honored every precept and command. We love Him because He first loved us. He is the source of our life, of our love, and hence also, for the same necessary reason of our faith. But here again, men are liable to be mis-led by the common notion prevailing. They can talk of the life of God, and the life of Christ. They also speak of the love of God, and of the love of Jesus. And they refer man's regenerate life and man's Christian love to the fontal source of the same holding in God: but they have no power so to speak of faith.

Faith *in* God, and faith *towards* Jesus Christ, is as far as

they can go: making faith to hold only in the ground of man's life; by some magic force which may thus go out towards God or Christ, as a tendency of their belief towards an object—as a historical fact. But they have no power to speak in the apostolic sense of "the faith OF God," (Rom. iii. 3,) "faith OF Jesus Christ," (Rom. iii. 20,) "the faith OF the Son of God," (Gal. ii. 20,) "the faith OF Him," (Eph. iii. 12,) "the faith which is IN Christ," (2 Tim. iii. 15,) and "through the faith OF Jesus Christ" (Phil. iii. 9). These, and kindred scripture passages, cannot by any fair construction, be made to mean only man's exercise of faith in Christ, or towards God—nor yet are they synonymous with the general Christian faith, as a system of doctrine.

Christ's own righteousness, as the Divine-human Redeemer, tempted, tried, in sufferings and triumphs, rests first of all in His own personal faith, by which He, the God-man, wrought obedience to the law. As He hence, becomes the Fountain of righteousness, having it in personal possession; so, He also becomes the Fontal source of man's faith, which rests in the ground and element of Christ's faith. As we only can have real righteousness by "the faith of Him;" so, the Christian life that we now live in the flesh, we "live by the faith of the Son of God." The human exercise of faith, only can find place, because of the divine-human faith of Christ's own Person. Subjective faith in us, holding primally in that of Christ, gives us "access with confidence *by the faith of Him*" into the grace of salvation. This faith, which in Christ became perfect obedience and complete righteousness, contains all the substance of redemption and the evidence of saving grace.

Jesus Christ's divine-human life with all its benefits is "the mystery of the faith,"(1 Tim. iii. 9,) which must be held in a pure conscience. In the ground of that life, we are to hold our new life by the Holy Ghost; and our faith partakes of the nature of His; just as our life partakes also of the nature of His incarnate life (2 Pet. i. 4). As in Christ was first life in the new creation, before men can have new life in Him; so, by the faith of the God-man, we have the gift of God bestowed on us.

Man's nature has a capacity for faith, on the same ground only that it has a capacity for being saved in the life of Jesus, who mediates all grace to man, That is, because it was possible for the Son of God, to assume our human nature, in the mystery of the Incarnation, and so make an at-one-ment between God and man; therefore is it only possible also, for man's soul now to be joined in the bond of fellowship, with the *life* and *faith* of Jesus Christ.

Faith, that involves and includes all His obedience and righteousness, being wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, enables us to lay hold of and appropriate the benefits of His redemption. Thus His life becomes our life; His faith, our faith; and therefore, His righteousness, our righteousness (Rom. v. 1). Belief, merely, does not grow into Christian faith; but faith enables us to believe in Christ. It is so in the case of Peter's noble confession. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." To this Jesus at once replies, "Blessed art thou Simon Barjonah: flesh and blood" (mere nature) "hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." His power of faith to confess the "truth as it is in Jesus," was the gift of God. So always, in the ground of Christ's life, is the power of the human exercise of faith.

> "Faith, 'tis a precious grace, where'er it is bestowed;
> It boasts of a celestial birth, and is the gift of God."

Re-union of man's soul, or the life of humanity with the life of God, is the object and end of redemption's great work. This is brought to pass first in the person of the God-man, whose divine-human life united the two natures; and thereby raised our fallen life from the death of sin. The ground of that mysterious union, is the ground and fontal spring of all faith; therefore, also, of all the life we now inherit by virtue of that miraculous fact. Hence, there is in Him primarily, "the faith of God," even that which is by "faith of" (not only *in*) "Jesus Christ." Now since the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and having access by faith, and righteousness by faith, and therefore being justified by faith, the life that we now live we *can* "live by the faith, of the Son of God,"—not as some would only say, by faith IN the Son of God. This is the "faith

which is *in* Christ Jesus" first; and by His grace from Him, because ours, as the gift of God, when His divine-human life is formed in us, raising us to glory and honor and immortality and eternal life.

If there were no fountain, there could be no stream. As therefore, love is of God, for God is love in its fontal source, whence the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; so faith, the supernatural endowment of the human soul, must have a divine source. And that holds manifestly in the Person and life of Jesus, whose life first itself "was made perfect through suffering." His faith wrought obedience which now by full righteousness re-binds our life to the life of God, through the mystery of His incarnate life in us. Is it then too much to affirm, that faith, the very principle that justifies us, ruled the humanity of our Lord Jesus, and that it wrought in Him that full obedience and perfect righteousness which taketh away the sin of the world?

THIS FAITH HOLDS IN THE CREED OBJECTIVELY FOR CHRIST'S DISCIPLES.

Christian Faith, the Apostles doctrine, has for us, the force of supernatural power, to confront us with the invisible and heavenly realities of the world to come, now being made known by the Church. Wrought in Christ's disciples, it reveals the unseen mysteries of grace, otherwise hid from the foundations of the world. It sets before us the divine constitution of this order of grace in the kingdom of heaven, now at hand to save men. Yielding to its conditions freely, as submissive children in the arms of our Almighty Lord, we become His disciples and He confers on us sacramentally (the only way He has promised) the powers of His salvation—including, of course always, the only merits of His suffering, death, resurrection and mediation, which give us righteousness and justification.

Vitally joined with the life and faith of Christ, the whole habit and tenor of the Christian's life will be, by faith; bearing fruits and good-works. Communicating to us the power of the life and faith of Christ, in which we are thus made par-

takers, we have the wondrous fruits of faith. It is not therefore a mere wonder-working of magic; but a supernatural miracle-working power. Objective faith works in us from Christ's life, through the Holy Ghost; and, by this heavenly power now at hand for us, "since faith is come," we repent, and believe, and obey. Then the subjective faith of the individual disciple will be the out-growth, springing from the life of the "True Vine," of which the believer is now a living branch partaking of the divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4). Bearing the image of the heavenly, Christ is formed in him the hope of glory; and the life is hid with Christ in God, so that the life he now lives in the flesh, he lives "by the faith of the Son of God."

Repentance, godly sorrow that needeth not to be repented of; hearty trust, the child-like confidence of love; hope, the anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, that taketh hold of that within the veil; and penitent, contrite, submissive obedience to the will of God, may now find place unto life and salvation. Now the believer apprehends that by which he has already, in the faith of Jesus Christ, been apprehended (Phil. iii. 12). The divine power of Christian love is now the mainspring of every action. Precisely in this does the life of a believer, that is, one under the divine order of faith, differ from an unbeliever, that is one who has not this supernatural grace, or organ of divine endowment, to receive and understand the mysteries of the gospel. An unbeliever, that is, an infidel, is a bald negation of the highest truth of man's being. Rationalism is only of earth earthy.

Human exercise of an active faith, the supernatural endowment, implanted by divine grace in the soul, must go out towards an object. Holding the supernatural contents of the Creed, there will be subjective acts of belief, receiving as verities the sum of the Gospel revelation. This produces formal acts of obedience of faith; man meanwhile feeling, owning and freely obeying, the unseen powers of the world to come. The mysterious contents of our faith, become real to us in the active exercise of this divine grace.

The Gospel which Paul preached was "THE Faith in Christ"

(Acts xxiv. 24). This is more than indefinitely "faith in Christ," as it is commonly presented by preachers. Jesus commissioned Paul to bear the blessings of Gospel grace to the Gentiles, by virtue of the faith that is lodged in Jesus' own life (Acts xxvi. 18), and because of which, they might be sanctified and saved by believing in Him.

This same Gospel, especially its Scriptural sum, in the Apostles' creed challenges our faith, and calls it into saving activity. We thereby hold for truth the Doctrine of Christ's Gospel revealed "from faith to faith" (Rom. i. 17.) In the broad ground of the Faith of Christ, we have faith in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. This faith in us cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. The Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts, by the *preaching* of the Gospel and confirms it by the *use* of the sacraments. The Church is the divine human bearer of all this to lost and ruined man.

Deep and solemn as are the heavenly mysteries of the articles of our undoubted Christian Creed, they are within the compass and grasp of even child-faith. Indeed only on this plane can any one come to a proper apprehension of the kingdom of heaven. We must all receive it in the humble spirit of a little child.

Just as we "understand by faith that the worlds were made," without knowing *the how*, by any process of reasoning; so, the mysteries of the Incarnation, the mystery of the Trinity, and the mysteries of the holy Sacraments, are for the apprehension of faith; not for rationalism. All the divinely supernatural contents of the Christian Faith, all the verities of the Gospel system, are in the Creed. We believe the Creed; and that is the formal expression of the sum of our faith. But the creed itself only *rules* our faith objectively; it never *creates* that for us, but holds direct relation to the ground, the principle, the source, the fountain of faith—the faith of Christ.

The Faith of the Son of God is therefore at all points and ever, for us, the ground of our spiritual life; into which we are regenerated by the Holy Ghost in the use of the means of grace, the Word and Sacraments.

But since this faith itself is the gift of God in the grace of our Lord Jesus, is there not wrong done those who have not that heavenly power in saving efficacy? Not if the evangelical command to become "obedient to the faith," "repent and believe the gospel," (Mark i. 15,) presupposes the possible possession of this grace; because the kingdom of heaven is now at hand helping men to its benefits. Unto all to whom the challenge comes, by the Church in the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments, is there, in the redemptive life of the God-man, sufficient ground and possibility for individual personal faith. To him that hath, shall, most truly here be given; and from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath. The most damning sin of unbelief is just in this divine fact, THAT FAITH IS COME, and they now can, but *will not* believe. God has made it possible for men in Christ to be saved by faith; but they will not obey God's conditions of repentance, faith, baptism and doing what He commands the Church to teach them; but proudly refuse to exercise faith, and so despise His grace. Shall *their unbelief* make the *faith* (of whom?) of God," (that is the objective principle of salvation), "without effect" (Rom. iii. 3). Nay: that faith exists outside of individual man, with all its saving power, and needs only be embraced by those it first apprehends—and it saves.

Yielding ready and free obedience to the will of God, having a childlike spirit of docile submission to His guidance, and falling in hearty trust into His compassionate arms of mercy, is what God requires of us, in order to be saved. Only do not resist His Spirit, and He will regenerate us in Christ. Just let God work faith in our hearts, and He gives us power to believe unto righteousness and make confession unto salvation (Rom. x.). This is especially true of the children of the covenant. If they only do not *break the covenant;* or by a carnal heart of unbelief, make the covenant grace of God, as to themselves, of non-effect—they will be saved. As long as they are truly enfolded in the arms of our mother, the Church, they are safe. He that shows his faith in obeying the voice of the Church, which is to him the voice of Christ, calling him to believe and

be baptized and do what He has commanded, shall be saved by the faith of the Son of God.

Faith in the soul of man therefore rests in the broader ground of the faith of Christ; it is comprehended in the element of the life of our blessed Mediator, whose redeeming power in the sphere and order of grace is the kingdom of heaven now at hand. This teaches concerning "THE FAITH IN CHRIST." The human soul, by the power of this endowment of God, is brought within the reach and influence of this life-imparting mystery, the Incarnation, the life of the God-man. This "undying fact" is the ground, the primal source, the springing fountain life of our faith. We receive this "great fact of Christ's advent in the flesh," with all its divine contents by faith; which joins us in full union with the new life and gracious Person of the God man. And this now is the element in the new creation in which we live and move. In this objective and historical sense we confess our faith in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, "after the power of an endless life."

Here we find an order of existence above mere nature. To be brought into vital union and fellowship with it, is more than can be done by mere flesh and blood. The new birth, by water and the Spirit transfers us from the order of nature into the order of grace; where we are put in communication with the life of the supernatural world. In this is the domain of Faith: just as sense and reason rule in the lower sphere of Nature. We, thus believing, yield ourselves, to the authority of God's victorious grace, "to acccomplish its saving work upon us in its own way."

Christian life in us becomes Christ-like, because the life of Christ is our life. Under the power of "the faith of Him," we are therefore to live the life that we now live in the flesh. It gives us here a supernatural principle, a miraculous power, which enables us to conquer the flesh, the world and the devil. This victory is the divine fruit of our faith; and our faith believes that JESUS IS THE CHRIST—that God is come in the flesh (1 Jno. v. 1–5).

This view of faith, in its fontal and objective character,

though somewhat peculiar, is nevertheless, as is indeed quite apparent from the force of the proofs given, SCRIPTURAL. That it is not common, and has not prominently prevailed in the general theological thinking of the age, is at first indeed a grave occasion for reflection as to its validity. In the Reformation conception of the great and cardinal doctrine of faith, there remains, however, yet wide room for normal development on the attainments of the past. Must we be shut up, at all points by the limits of old conceptions; or, may there be freedom for the true Bible liberty of the scribe, who like a householder, bringeth forth out of his treasures things both *new* and old?

No special need at the present time, calls for the bringing out of the subjective side of faith, as it holds in the human factor. For while we cannot indeed just say, that there is too much account made of that view of faith; yet it may be so viewed, from the standpoint of the mere human exercise of it, as to lose in large degree firm hold on the only true foundation of its divine human power. Human faith is only faith at all, as that comes from the Divine human, holding its centre in the Person of Christ.

By referring the ground of faith entirely, as modern thought is prone to do, to the soul of MAN, rather than to the life of the GOD-MAN, we may come to hold its principle after all, to be only natural, instead of supernatural.

The *faith of man* IN *man*, mere human credit, resting in a human object, is *humanitarianism*. This is too common in our age; and its moral reforms, and human perfectibility schemes, need to be opposed steadily by the true Faith of Christianity.

The *popular faith of man, in the Bible*, only natural belief in a true record, so far as human reason can receive it, is running our popular thinking with tremendous velocity, into *historical rationalism*. Here indeed the letter killeth. There is therefore crying want for "the grace of God which bringeth salvation." The good fight of true faith, must be fought on this line.

The faith *of man in nature*, a sort of human trust in the available uses of the external world, or man's life striving to perfect

itself in the mastery of the powers of nature, is *materialism*. Its chief aim is the subjugation of the mighty forces of material nature, to the use of man. This to be attained, is the highest good of its false prophets. This needs therefore to be challenged with the more real powers of supernatural grace and truth.

Then, finally, *the faith of man in the all divinity of the universe*, human faith holding all things to be divine, God in every thing, and from all things in sum, making its God, is *pantheism*. There is more of this at work in the thinking of our times, than is perhaps generally understood. Unconsciously entering into popular theories, its virus works all the more fatally in making shipwreck of the faith. The truth as it is in Jesus is its only complete corrective and cure.

It is not therefore mere speculative thinking, that seeks for the true principle and fountain source of objective Christian Faith, the apprehension and appropriation of the atoning merits of Christ, in His own Divine Human Person. Only when holding in this central ground can our faith, the justifying principles "revealed from (His) faith to (our) faith." (Rom. i. 17) become for us, an efficacious power to save. "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and THE FAITH OF JESUS." (Rev. xiv. 12).

Art. IX.—ALTAR AND PRIEST.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M.

There has been really but one altar, and but one priest, in the whole history of fallen man. That altar is the cross, and that priest is Christ. Before Him there were altars and priests only in the sense of *preparation;* after Him, only in the way of *participation.*

The cross is the only real altar, because on it alone was offered to God for sin such a satisfaction precisely as the nature of the case required—and Christ is the only real priest, because it was He alone that offered it. Taking it for granted that man is unable to render this satisfaction by himself, but must do it by another, let us look at the things which are required of this substitute, both by man's fallen condition, and by the eternal justice and truth of God, to discover if these are not realized for the first and only time, in the offering up of Jesus Christ once for all. In the first place it is required that the substitute enter into the very constitution of man's being, fallen and sinful as it is, and by virtue of this union, though personally guiltless, actually bear his sins and infirmities. The same nature that sinned must likewise make satisfaction for sin. Since by man came death, by man must come also the resurrection from the dead. The birds and beasts, therefore, whose blood was shed on many an ancient altar, could not possibly bear in themselves, being of another nature, the sin of man. This is a first and fundamental reason why it is not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin. They cannot have it upon them to take away. The substitution of an animal without blemish, and the laying of their hands upon its head, confessing their sins, was to the Jews but an expression of their faith, dark and

dim though it were, in Him, who, though divine, took unto Himself our nature in its fallen condition, and thus also our sins. Of Him alone, being flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, can it be really said, "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree, he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, he who knew no sin was made sin for us." The view that He bore our sins merely in the way of sympathy, or by an arbitrary outward imputation, is wholly excluded (Hebrews ii. 14–17). Our sins were laid upon Him when He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. Though free from personal guilt, He bare these sins of ours, all His holy life, from the manger to the cross.

It is required of man's substitute, in the second place, to suffer and die, in such way that the effect thereof may be the perfection of its own nature. The object of divine love cannot be the mere shifting of sin from one to another, but must be its entire abolition. Sin and its consequences being overcome, there is room for the development to perfection of the original life. This, it seems, cannot be effected but by pain and death. Sin and suffering go together. God Himself has so constituted things. He did not arbitrarily appoint, but simply announced, death as the penalty of man's transgression. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." So also after man's disobedience and fall, the justice of God is satisfied not by witnessing merely the shedding of another's blood, including the pain and death involved therein, but by the state into which man's nature is brought by such shedding of blood. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Thus was it intimated already in the Jewish dispensation that the object or design of sacrifice was to bring our nature into such condition as was pleasing to God. That state, however, was but the subjective one of contrition, as the Psalmist said, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."

But it is just here where again Jewish sacrifices substantially failed. As the animal had not the nature of man, and could not really bear his sin; so neither could it, by any process it passed through, bring that nature to a state of freedom from sin and of perfection. Though it suffered and died, though its blood was sprinkled upon the altar, and though it thus brought the sincere worshipper to a sorrow for sin, yet it never rose from its death with its own life perfected, much less with the life of man which it never possessed. This is an essential part of the reason why it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. But Christ is alone the true Lamb of God that really takes away the sin of the world, because He not only took upon Him our nature, and with it our sins, but also suffered and died, and, by His passion and death, brought, in the divinely mysterious connection of things, that nature in Himself, through His resurrection from the dead, to a state of perfection and glory. The Son of God, having once freely and mercifully taken our fallen nature unto Himself, must needs suffer if He wished to carry out His mission in the world, because of the connection, to us inscrutable, between sin and death. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" He, who carried our sin, also both put it away by the sacrifice of Himself, and at the same time Himself became perfect through His sufferings. This is the very language of the Holy Scriptures. So that when our Saviour rose from the dead, He arose with a humanity free from all the effects of the fall, with a humanity that now, after a brief season of perhaps further development, as well as of manifestation, was fitted to go into the very presence of the Father in all the glory of His eternal holiness and justice.

It is required of man's substitute, in the last place, not only to bear the nature and sin of man, as also to put away the sin and to purify that nature in its own perfection, but likewise to be able to impart its own now complete life to those in whose behalf it was sacrificed. The end is reached not simply by the perfection of the substitute, but by the perfection also of those for whom the substitute was provided. For this reason also it

is impossible for bulls and goats, which, when once killed, never rose again to impart a new life, to take away sins. Such sacrifices could never make *the comers* thereunto *perfect.* Such necessity was typified, but only typified, and perhaps unconsciously acknowledged by the Jews, when they *partook of the flesh* of the lamb that was offered in sacrifice to God. But when the Lamb of God died for our sins, He arose again to bestow upon us righteousness and life (Romans iv. 25). Before His death, he was not in a condition to communicate Himself substantially to His disciples. This He taught them plainly. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The Saviour, by His most holy passion, and death, and glorious resurrection, carried our humanity into such a state that it can now be re-communicated to all believers. Being *Himself made perfect*, He became the Author of salvation unto all them that obey Him (Hebrews v. 7–9). By the operation of the Holy Ghost, the power of the Saviour's life is imparted to believers, by virtue of which they are in Him new creatures, old things having passed away, and all things become new. When this work in them is by Him through the appointed means fully accomplished, then will they be like Jesus Christ, and fit to enter with Him into the immediate presence of God, in which is fulness of joy, and to go to His right hand, where there are pleasures forevermore.

Such being the overwhelming force of a real sacrifice for sin, the CROSS, upon which it was offered, that is, upon which His sufferings, commenced at His conception, were concentrated and "finished," is THE ALTAR of humanity. It is here where the idea of sacrifice is absolutely realized. It is to this that must be referred all remission of sin and reconciliation to God. Well may St. Paul exclaim, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

If this is the altar, it is not difficult to answer the question, Who is the Priest? It can be no other than He, who so freely offered Himself upon it, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

He is the priest, because it was by the free determination of His own will that He emptied Himself of divine glory, took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and when found in fashion as a man, every step in life was a free act of obedience, patiently submitting Himself even to the death of the cross. The temptation to turn from this course was real. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." In Him victim and priest are one. Through the sacrifice which He alone offered, can sin be pardoned. There never was, nor will there ever be, a Priest like Him. He hath an unchangeable priesthood, because He continueth forever. No man can come to God but by Him, and every one is invited to come by Him to God.

The sacrifice of Christ is of universal force, reaching out in all directions, and intended to benefit men of every age and race, who have come under the power of the Fall. Yet it was four thousand years before the altar, upon which it was offered, was erected—it has been eighteen centuries since. In what way did men before, and in what way do men since the incarnation, come under the power of the sacrifice made once for all? We answer, by means of ordinances appointed by God, and of men chosen by Him to administer them. Although both, to possess any value, must have direct reference to Christ, yet must the ordinances appointed before, having reference to a Christ to come, be essentially different from those appointed after, having reference to a Christ that is actually come. What is the difference?

The difference specifically is the same as that which obtains in general between the Old Dispensation and the New. Failure to recognize the true relation and yet the essential difference between these two Dispensations is the rock on which many theologically split. They are most frequently regarded as occupying the same level in the economy of man's salvation. Yet

the Scriptures are clear in inculcating that the New is as high above the Old, as Christ, the Mediator of the one, is above Moses, the mediator of the other. "Moses gave you not that true bread from heaven: but my Father giveth you the true bread (Christ) from heaven." He that is least in the kingdom of heaven, actual entrance into which is possible only under the New Dispensation, is greater than all the Old Testament prophets and saints. Before the manifestation of the Word in the flesh, and His consequent atonement, all could only have been *shadow*—since that time on, all must be *substance*. The one was a period of preparation, the other of possession.

Of the ordinances and ceremonies of the old law, that of sacrifice was one of central significance. It must therefore partake in an eminent degree of the preparative and shadowy nature which belongs to the whole dispensation. The central ordinance of the New Testament is confessedly the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It must therefore partake preëminently of the substantial character of that dispensation. It stands for that reason on a higher level, because in a closer relation to Christ crucified, than all the sacrifices of Jewish priests. If indeed the sacrifice of a Jewish lamb possessed value in itself, and altogether independent of the sacrifice of Christ, then might it well be regarded as of more significance and power than the Lord's Supper, which is of value only in virtue of its connection with the one sacrifice on the cross. But this view would be taking Christ out of His true position as *the Head* of humanity, and ignoring His name as the only one given under Heaven among men whereby must be saved not merely ourselves but men of every age and nation. It cannot be for a moment held. The only significance of Jewish sacrifice, as we have previously seen, consists in its preparation for the real sacrifice, and in its being the means of giving the people an interest in that sacrifice which was to come, merely in the way of faith and hope. Neither was the Jewish sacrifice a real sacrifice, nor is the Holy Eucharist, as Romanists at present hold. But both possess a sacrificial character, because of their reference to the sacrifice of Christ. Inasmuch now as possession is better than hope, and

a Saviour present of more force than a Saviour promised, the Lord's Supper, which has to do with the former, possesses *more of a sacrificial character*, than Jewish sacrifice, which has to do merely with the latter. Were it not so, why was the one abrogated, and the other put in its stead? Having new bottles shows the presence of new wine. When the Saviour ate of the paschal lamb for the last time, He transformed this into something different, and for that very reason higher, by giving His disciples bread and wine to eat and drink, which was the communication, as St. Paul says, of His own body and blood. In the one feast they partook of a typical lamb, in the other they were to partake of the true Lamb. For in the institution of the latter the Saviour said, "Take, eat; this is *my* body, which is broken for you. This is *my* blood of the *New Testament*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." If indeed, in the face of these solemn divine words, Christians choose to rob this ordinance of its substantial reference to Christ, and make it a mere empty memorial of a sacrifice, the force of which to put away sin is not present, they are in danger of following in the tracks of their prototypes, the Jews, who robbed their ordinance of even its typical reference to Christ, and offered mere vain oblations; and as they by this misuse were gradually drawn into such a state as not to be able to recognize and receive the Saviour at His first coming, so there may be danger of their antitypes, by a similar misuse, failing in the power of discerning and acknowledging the Saviour at His second coming. There may be Pharisees and Sadducees among Christians at that great day.

Neither of them is an *altar* in the real sense, but if the place on which Jewish sacrifices were offered, could in any sense be so denominated, much more does the name appropriately belong to the place, on which are laid and consecrated the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. This altar may be constructed in whatever shape or form you please; you may have a box, or bracket, or an ordinary table; you may build it of iron, wood or marble. That is not a matter of the greatest importance. Still the idea of altar calls for an outward form or shape pecu-

liarly its own. This the first Christians were not in a condition to realize at once, just as at first also they had no church buildings, but worshipped in private houses, or wherever else they could quietly assemble together. Afterwards, when they could have churches, it was felt that they should be of a certain style of architecture peculiar to the Christian idea of worship, and different from buildings used for purposes of the world. So at first no doubt ordinary tables were used, but afterwards such as corresponded to the particular idea. We could not expect therefore in the New Testament any mention of *altar* as a place on which to lay the visible elements of the Lord's Supper, as indeed we find *no name whatever* mentioned as connected with such place, except in two instances. The Saviour, in the institution of the Sacrament, took the elements from the table at which they were celebrating the paschal feast, because that was the time and place in which the Passover was superseded by the Holy Eucharist. St. Paul also speaks of the Lord's table, and the table of devils (1 Cor. x). But it is to be remarked that in both these instances the idea of altar must have been present in the minds of those concerned. For the paschal lamb, whose flesh was laid on the table, was slain at the altar and its blood sprinkled thereon, so that at the table they partook of the altar. Also St. Paul, in the passage above referred to, in speaking of the Holy Communion, "represents it not as a sacrifice, as Roman Catholics maintain, but clearly as a sacrificial repast, as is shown distinctly by the parallel of analogous usages among Jews and Gentiles." The idea was there, if not the name. When we recall to mind that the early Christians celebrated the Communion every Lord's day, that the memory of the dreadful night in which it was appointed must have ever accompanied the disciples, that Paul so solemnly warns against the danger of becoming guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, we cannot but feel that it must have been regarded as of central significance, and of most solemn force and power. Being so regarded, it was but natural and legitimate that, as they began to possess regular church buildings, the worship therein should centre and fix itself upon the altar. So now we need to

have our altars restored in our churches, and constructed in such way as to be true to the idea which calls for them. If the closet, the family altar, or any other place where important events occur, is a consecrated spot, much more is that in which all our worship centres, and where we make the nearest approach to Christ this side heaven.

In the same sense in which there are *altars* in the Christian church, there must also be *priests*. Altar and priest are correlative terms. Where there is an altar, there must be a priest; where there is a priest, he must have an altar.* Jewish altars had Jewish priests, and Christian altars must have Christian priests. There must be too the same difference between these several priests as there is between the altars at which they respectively minister, involving, as they do, the essential difference between the two dispensations in which they severally stand. Christ Jesus being the only real Priest, Christian ministers, who occupy a substantial relation to Him, are possessed decidedly of a more priestly character than Jewish priests, who only helped to prepare the way for His coming.

The question, Who are to minister at the altars which are called for and actually found in the Christian church? cannot be answered by saying, all God's people as members of the universal Christian priesthood. And for this simple and plain reason, *they have particular altars of their own, at which to fulfil their office of priesthood.* Ministers and people alike, as together constituting "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," are, as a part of their functions, "to present themselves daily living sacrifices of thankfulness to God;" "to offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually;" "to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;" "to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, their reasonable service." But all this does not meet the wants of the case. Besides these universal altars there are, as we have seen, special altars, which require

* The Episcopal Prayer Book, with strange inconsistency, recognizes priests, but not altars. Better *altar* and *minister* (in which term the idea of priest is included) than *table* and *priest*.

special priests. There is a Baptism to be administered, a public worship in the Sanctuary to be headed, most of all, a Holy Supper to be dispensed. Who are to attend to these things? Everybody? It was not so in the old covenant. There they had the universal priesthood, too. God, by Moses, proclaimed to all the Jews: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; and ye shall be unto me *a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.*" Notwithstanding all this, they had special priests, who had such duties to fulfil that it was death to any one else who should attempt to do them. The universal priesthood of the Jews, which consisted in obeying the voice of God, and keeping His covenant, was continued until it was caught up in the higher universal priesthood of Christian believers, which consists in a real offering of themselves to God on the basis of a vital union with Him through Jesus Christ. So the special priesthood of Jewish priests, which consisted in sacrificing at typical altars, was superseded by the higher special priesthood of Christian ministers, which consists in serving at the substantial altars of the Gospel. All Christian people are *prophets*, too, and *kings*, as well as priests. As such, they have to "confess His name, and, with free conscience, fight against sin and the Devil in this life, and hereafter, in eternity, reign with Him over all creatures." Yet these duties on their part do not obviate the necessity of having *special prophets* to occupy the pulpit, and authoratively preach all the words of this life, and *special kings*, to manage and control the general affairs of the church and congregation. "Are *all* apostles? are *all* prophets? are *all* teachers?" that is, in the special sense? Nay, the very object of special prophets and kings is to bring about and promote the prophetical and kingly character of the whole body of believers, as it is written: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the ful-

ness of Christ." In like manner, the special priesthood is in order to the universal priesthood. While on the one hand the persons that enter into the special proceed from the universal, on the other the universal without the special could not be maintained. It is in virtue of what the special is divinely authorized and commissioned to do, that believers enter upon and perform their functions as priests. The universal, including ministers and people alike, is the ultimate end, and the special is its servant. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," through the means of grace administered by the persons appointed (Eph. iv. 11–13, as quoted above), "and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever." Christ Himself, after His incarnation, became what He now is, by that which He did and suffered. He became a servant to Himself, and thus to humanity. "He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." In the Jewish economy the priests offered sacrifice both for their own sins and for the sins of the people. In the New Testament something is done in a divinely appointed way by divinely appointed men, by which such vital interest is effected in the one sacrifice of Christ that both people and ministers equally and alike are made partakers of the perfection of their common Redeemer. Ministers are servants both to their people and themselves. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."

It is often said that the people are privileged to go directly to God, by faith and prayer, without the intervention of any human priest but Christ.* When this is said, it is said under the false impression that a priest is one who *stands in the way* of their direct approach to Him. Whereas it is the opposite that is true: a priest is one whose sole object is *to bring the*

* If the priesthood of Christ does away with the idea of a *special* priesthood, it does away also with the idea of a *universal*. For Christ, being the only real Priest, has performed *all the duties* of the office, why then should there be priests now of any kind?

people directly to God. Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, did not appear for the purpose of preventing the coming of men to God, but of bringing them into His very presence! Yet, in the way of making satisfaction for sin, no mortal could come into the presence of God as He did. Jewish priests were appointed not to be hindrances, but helps to the people in their approaches to the Lord their God. While none but themselves could come before God, as far as their priestly functions were concerned, yet, by those very ministrations, they and their people together enjoyed the special presence and favor of God. Christian priests are not intended to keep the people from direct access to God through Christ, by faith and prayer, but so to minister unto their spiritual wants as *to enable them properly and the more fully to do so.* That which they do to help them can, of course, be done only by themselves, as Christ appointed, and "no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that was called of God, as was Aaron." Yet what they do finds its ultimate end only in bringing themselves and people into the most intimate union and communion with God. Faith and prayer are impossible to those who despise the ordinances of God. It is vain for a man to think he enjoys the favor of God by faith, who refuses to be baptized; it is vain for a man to attempt to pray, who fails to observe the command of the Lord: "Do this, in remembrance of me," and neglects the assemblies of the saints. Men can come into the presence of God, by faith and prayer, only when they are faithful to the ministrations of His Church, and when, like the three thousand converted on the day of Pentecost, they "continue steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Those who are to administer these means of grace in the Christian Church are more decidedly appointed, set apart, and established in their succession, than those who offered sacrifice in the Jewish. God, by Moses, called Aaron to be His priest, but God, by His Son in the flesh, called the apostles to be His ministers. God ordained that Aaron's sons, by natural generation, should perpetuate the priesthood until Shiloh came;

God ordained that the Apostles should, by a spiritual succession, through the laying on of hands, perpetuate the ministry until the end of time. A minister of the Word, once lawfully called to his office, is bound to continue in the service of the sanctuary as long as he lives, giving himself wholly to the work, and not permitted to devote himself to a secular calling without permission of the Church."

But it may be said that the New Testament nowhere calls ministers of the Gospel *priests*. Be it so. There is a very good reason. The three important functions to be performed in behalf of sinful man are the prophetical, the priestly, the kingly. But when these are really fufilled, they are *inseparable*. Christ Jesus is the Prophet, Priest, and King of humanity, but being such by the very constitution of His person, while we may theoretically, we cannot actually, separate His ministry into three distinct classes. Going back, however, to the days of types and shadows, we witness the three offices springing up as the times demanded, and filled by distinct classes of men, all *because* the shadow was there and not the substance. Now, in the Christian dispensation, the offices, being united or flowing together in Christ, are in the same character perpetuated in the Christian ministry, and therefore inseparable. For this reason we could not expect ministers to be called priests, thus ignoring their prophetical and kingly functions. Neither are they, nor could they properly be called *prophets* (in the sense of ordinary teachers), or *kings*. If it were true that the great and exclusive work of ministers was to *preach the Gospel*, as generally represented, we could reasonably expect the name of *prophet* to be their scriptural title. But priests are they no less called than prophets. And it must be remarked that neither priest, nor prophet, nor king is the distinctive name of Him who is all these in one, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, our Lord. The Apostles were called neither prophets, nor priests, nor kings, though they united in themselves this threefold office. If they were to fulfil the duties only of prophet and king, in order to carry on the work of Christ in those forms, and not to fulfil at the

same time the duty of priest, in order to carry on the work of Christ in that form, we would then have a religion prepared *to teach* and ready *to reign*, but not fitted *to atone* and *renew*. To announce salvation in Christ, without the capacity of administering the means of *participation*, would be cruel—to hope to manage or control the affairs of a church without members, would be absurd. To denominate ministers exclusively either *priests*, as in the Roman church, or *preachers*, as in some Protestant churches, is one-sided and unscriptural. Because forsooth, the Apostle Paul was an eminently successful preacher, and stated on one occasion that he was thankful, because of party strife, that it so occurred that he had himself baptized but a few that it might not be said he had baptized in his own name, it does not follow, nor can it be asserted, that on that account he set aside or undervalued the priestly function of his ministry.

While we make due account of the prophetical and kingly in Christianity, let us not rob ourselves of the priestly. The exercise of the prophetical requires more talent, and is therefore more showy, but let it not on that account overshadow the easy and plain.* Let the altar stand, and bear upon it the sacramental signs and seals of the presence of the once crucified but now exalted Saviour; let the Minister of the Lord stand at its side and administer to us therefrom the bread and water of life, as he also from the same place causes the incense of our prayers to ascend to heaven, until Christ be visibly present, and we shall all alike reign with Him as kings and priests to our God forever.

---

* This is no doubt a reason of the tendency in the human mind to exalt the prophetical, at the expense of the priestly function of the ministry. In preaching, there is room for the display of the most varied learning and all the powers of oratory, by which the minds of men are captivated and spell bound. It is here that ministers are called upon to exert all the talents, which Heaven has bestowed upon them, in arousing men and leading them to the cross. It is here alone that they make a name and rise in the estimation of the world, whether intentionally or unintentionally. But for this there is no room whatsoever in their priestly ministrations. To sprinkle a little water upon a person's head, to bless and distribute a little bread and wine is simple, incapable of variation, and done in short time. Yet who does not know that the mightiest results spring sometimes from the most simple causes?

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN THE INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By T. F. Curtis, D.D., late Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Pa. Published by Appletons.

Prominent among the distinctive features of the Baptist denomination are the slight value it attaches to creeds, and the high estimate it places upon the letter of the Scriptures. How closely these two principles lie to the heart of the Baptist system, it is not difficult to see. Accordingly, where either of them is in any measure abandoned, we naturally expect a departure from that exclusiveness with which, as a denomination, Baptists are charged.

Of this we have a remarkable illustration in the production before us. Not by any means that Dr. Curtis rejects immersion as the proper form of baptism, or expressly recognizes infant baptism as warrantable. He does go so far, however, as to say, that "if it should appear that Christian brethren of different denominations can increase their love and sympathy by partaking together of the Eucharist, instead of in their respective churches only, no ecclesiastical fetters should restrict them from doing so." This, now, does not say so much, certainly, as that infant baptism is in any sense valid, but this, at least, it does say, that a man may be included in the Christian brotherhood without being *immersed*.

Formerly Dr. C. held the exclusive theory, and vindicated it in a work published some years ago, entitled, the Progress of Baptist Principles. But his views on this subject have undergone a change, in common with those on the subject of Inspiration.

In handling this *locus* before his class, the author found himself involved in difficulty. The theory of the divine authorship of the Sacred Record, as held prevailingly by the preachers and theological teachers of this country, was, for him, untenable. Each successive recurrence to the topic, so far from leading him to a view which would be satisfactory to the denomination which supported the seminary, led him farther away. At last he resigns his professorship, and gives himself up to a thorough and independent investigation of the whole subject. The result of this, we have in the work before us.

Before entering into the discussion proper, Dr. Curtis gives us a bird's-eye view of the present state of opinion throughout the Church on this subject. This is pretty full and satisfactory, covering over seventy pages. We can here learn something of the opinion of nearly every prominent theologian of this century on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. But why does he confine himself to the present in giving us

this account? Surely modern theologians are not the only ones whose expression of view is worth listening to. Why not give us some insight into the history of the doctrine? It would be interesting for us to know, whether the early fathers regarded the Scriptures as infallibly dictated by the Holy Spirit; whether the Catholic Church ever set up any definite theory; how the school-men differed among themselves; to what extent uncertainty in regard to the precise nature of inspiration pervades the writings of the Reformers. We ought certainly to have been reminded of the fact, that the doctrine, as stated by the strictest teachers on the subject, took shape and form as late as the seventeenth century, when not only the formation of the canon, but the punctuation of the whole, including the Hebrew pointing, was declared to be absolutely infallible and divine. However, in what Dr. C. has given us, we have a fair presentation of almost all the different shades of view exhibited in modern theological literature, and this, probably, was deemed sufficient to prepare the reader for a candid consideration of a setting forth and vindication of the author's own views.

After the sketch just referred to, we find a classification of the various theories. In the first class are placed those which attribute to the Sacred Scriptures an absolute infallibility, not only so far as religious doctrine and practice are concerned, but in regard to matters of science and history. To the second belong those which allow historic and scientific matter to be colored by the age and opinions of the writer, but still claim infallibility for every statement specifically religious. Both of these theories are rejected; and then the author goes forward to show, that human error and infirmity are exhibited by the holy pensmen, in those precious writings which the Church has handed down to us as the Word of the living God.

In confirmation of his position, the author adduces a series of arguments, external and internal. The character of these are such as claim for themselves at least respectful consideration. The result of modern statistical investigation, the disclosures which geology makes in regard to the age of our globe and of the human race, belong to the first class. Among the internal arguments against infallibility, is the following: "No simple-minded reader would get the impression from the sacred writings, that their authors regarded themselves as absolutely exempted from error in their composition. On the contrary, the writers seem to speak as though they might possibly be in error. On page 315 we read as follows: "The official apostolical books of the New Testament have in that fact the assurance of inspiration. But as the divine authority given to these men to establish Christian Churches did not render their spoken words infallible individually, and nothing of that sort was ever promised them, nor thus understood by themselves or by others around them, so the sacred writings, while containing in the aggregate a system of the highest divine authority and inspiration, are not to be considered as individually and perfectly faultless."

Our space does not allow us to say any more, either in the way of stating or weighing the author's arguments. What we wish to do (and this is what we principally had in view in noticing it), is to direct attention to the drift of the production. No one need be surprised that the Unitarians of New England at once claimed it as confirmative of their own rationalistic position. And it must be conceded that much beside what has already been told, looks like a tendency in that direction. We hear the author speaking of God's revelation of himself in nature, in human intuition, in providence, etc., as though he put all this on a par, in a religious point of view, with the teachings of the sacred Scriptures. Whilst occasional expressions of this kind strike us unpleasantly, there is much, on the other hand, which we read with delight. On page 281 we have the following: "But while holding most firmly to these writings as the production of men who 'spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and therefore worthy of our highest reverence, being guides of divine authority as a whole, and authentic expositions of Christianity, we shall best show our reverence for them by a love of the *exact truth* in regard to their composition, in preference to such an idolatry of the letter of Scripture, as must destroy the veneration the good man will ever feel for its essence and spirit." And soon afterward we see the avowal that his "object is just the opposite of rationalism." That this may be the case is clear from the fact, that the mechanical inspiration theory, which he mainly opposes, is erected on rationalistic principles. He wants something more substantial than such a purely logical structure as this, upon which to rest his faith. That Dr. Curtis' tendency is opposed to rationalism, we think no one will doubt after reading the following: "A proper view of this subject will lead to a higher reverence for the authority of Scripture, as the record of that ever-living body, the kingdom of God, and the Church of the redeemed, in which he lives and reigns who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. Perhaps then it might seem especially from some developments which have actually taken place, that the chief danger of these (his own) views may be found rather in a certain tendency to mysticism (such as we see in High Church Episcopacy, or in transcendentalism) than to rationalism. And here, again, all turns upon the meaning we attach to terms. For there must ever be, as the basis of every human belief, something that transcends the mere reasoning process, something that goes beyond and back of it, some basis of authority on which all reasoning is grounded."

Dr. Curtis identifies the Mercersburg view with that of Dr. Tholuck and Dr. Pusey, and says that "it asserts that the Church and the Bible are inspired in such a manner, that from the combined influence of the two, faithful souls shall receive a fully sufficient and divine guidance for each exigency, one of practical infallibility to those who have faith in it, if not theoretically infallible for all mankind. There are many shades of this opinion, and its depth and force are little understood." The book before us clearly shows, that the author is not

far from a clear understanding of "its depth and force." To show that he is greatly in advance, not only of his own denominaton, but of the mass of American Protestantism on the point here touched upon, we will make the following extracts:—

"These views of the absolute infallibility of the written word (those which he is controverting) detract from the proper view and reverence for the Church as a practically inspired body. That there is a mystical body of Christ, in which he dwells and walks, and which justly claims great authority, the Scriptures plainly declare. In former ages, the Roman Catholic Church, with great plausibility, assumed to be alone that body, possessed of the keys, and as such to be infallible. The Protestants detected and exposed this error, but have many of them fallen into a worse, which is that the Church of Christ is not an *inspired* body, but a sort of voluntary society, or aggregate of such societies; only that and nothing more. The Church of Christ includes all who love and follow Him. And though the membership of it may be invisible to mortal eye, it acts with a visible and inspired power and authority upon each age, nation and community, leading it forward with a heavenly instinct and superior wisdom. There is the home of the Paraclete on earth. Thus all become in measure inspired with the presence of the Saviour, the life of God. Each individual Christian has the Spirit in degree, even alone, but he will also recognize a voice speaking to him through the Christian community with which he associates. . . . Notwithstanding the bickerings of sects and parties, the true Christian will love the Church of Christ as the Jerusalem which is from above and the mother of us all, free with her children from subjection to any undue authority, but guided by the animating spirit of Him who founded it. Rightly regarded, it utters not a mere verdict of the majority, but the voice of God in earth, asserting the foremost truths of each age to mankind, and inspiring men with the holy and loving thoughts of Christ's own nature. But a right practical view of the Church cannot, and does not, co-exist with a wrong and superstitious view of Scripture." Pp. 310 et seq.

Indications render it probable, that the Baptist denomination will repudiate this work of a former honored professor; but we hope that they will not be too fast. For we are convinced that they, with much of the rest of modern Protestantism, can learn many a lesson from it, which it will be profitable for them to ponder. We look upon it as one of the truly significant signs of the times. R.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1868.

Art. I.—THE STATE AS AN ELEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.*

BY JOHN H. OLIVER, ESQ., ALLENTOWN, PA.

Fellow Alumni:—Upon return, after years of absence, to this home of our literary youth, we see more clearly, that the central object of the College system was the growth and development of the intellectual powers. The time-honored college curriculum, sanctioned by the wisdom and experience of ages, what other object had it, than to bring into harmonious action all the varied powers of the mind? The study of languages, mathematics, logic, natural science, æsthetics, and philosophy, involved the constant exercise of language, memory, imagination, æsthetic taste, and of our reasoning powers, analytic and deductive, and these in all their sub-divisions embraced the whole of our intellectual life. Trained by these studies, the alumnus should leave the halls of his Alma Mater, the trained intellectual athlete, prepared to enter upon any vocation, to master the truths of any science or profession, distinguished only among his fellows for that superiority of intellectual powers, due to their careful discipline.

This discipline involved the contact of mind with mind; in the society halls with generous fellow-students; in the recitation room with learned professors; and with the great, good, and wise of all ages, both the living and the dead, in the rich

* An address delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshal College, Lancaster, Pa., July 7th, 1868.

lore of classic pages. The college was the nursery, and the soil the accumulated loam of the ages. Growth was the joint product of external and internal forces. The student was the individual, and society to him the great body of the learned, the living and the dead preceptors, who ministered to his intellectual wants.

And thus in miniature we see the passing panorama of the world's life. The susceptibility of growth involves the possibility of progress. This world of nature, from whose influences man cannot disengage himself, and to whose supplies he must constantly resort in the stages of this mortal life; the influences of the Family, Society, State, and the Church, and of the Republics of Art, Literature, and Science, are the external conditions of his growth. The native inborn constituents of his individual being are constantly asserting themselves. Ideas implanted in his nature become potential forces, whilst over all the phases of human activity, the hand of the Grand Master, the Architect of all, from whom and for whom are all things, extends its sovereign sway, subordinating all things to the consummation of the divine purpose. To show how the divine purpose, in the evolution of results from this complex of forces, has tended to man's elevation as an individual, a citizen, and a Christian, to his social improvement, to his progress in the Arts and Sciences, and to the development of all the constituents of his being, is to give the history of civilization. And need it be said, that such task must involve most patient inquiry and far-extending research; the keenest powers of analysis and the broadest powers of comprehension; that the theater of inquiry would be all the varied phases of human life; social science and morals; art, literature and the sciences; politics, philosophy and religion. As philosophy is the science of sciences, this would be the very philosophy of philosophies. From the rude rocks the geologist is busily gathering the materials to construct the history of the creation of this physical globe. In the sphere of civilization, whilst the materials are at hand in endless profusion and confusion, much must yet be deciphered from the hieroglyphs of the past, and the universal history of civilization remains yet to be written. And can it be written,

except as the truths, obscured by the darkness of the past and present, become luminous in the light of the future?

But let us narrow the field of inquiry, and consider the State as an element in civilization.

Man is a social being. Allied to the physical universe by the constituents of his physical being, and his constantly recurring physical wants, more living ligaments ally him with the other members of his race. The instincts of reproduction, the helplessness of infancy and the decrepitude of age, as well as the promptings of nature, give birth to the family relation, whilst the family stock is only saved to the race, as its maturing members forsake the family hearth-stone in search of new alliances. Why this instinctive regard to the good opinion of others and love of applause? Why this susceptibility of friendship and attachment, except that man was made to live in the presence of his fellows? Why this divine gift of speech, except that man was made to hold converse with man? Why this milk of human kindness coursing through our veins, if man is not to be the special object of beneficence? Why this gift of intellect divine, capable of mastering the mysteries of all science, if the untutored intellect, bereft of the gleanings of all other minds, is left to construct for itself unaided the theory of the universe? Why this imperious will, rendering men capable and ambitious of effecting great purposes by concerted action, unless associated men are to be the subjects of government? The careful study of the affections and sympathies of the human heart, of the faculties of the human intellect, and of the powers of man's will, serve to demonstrate, that man was made for society, and that society was made for man. Bereft of it, the individual is deprived of the means of his complete development; the affections become dwarfed by inaction; the mind shrivels to imbecility, and the man relapses into barbarism.

In man's social nature lie imbedded the idea and the necessity of the State. The exchange of nature's stores and of labor's products, that each may minister his complement to each other's needs, opening up the domains of agriculture, mechanism, commerce and trade; intercourse among men, whether as social, and involving more especially the domain of morals, for intel-

lectual purposes in the school, college, or university, or for religious ends in the expression of a common need and contrition, a common faith and hope; in fine, all shades of human activity, in all their endless ramifications, pre-suppose and necessitate law for their government. To leave its ascertainment and enforcement to the individual conscience and will, is to open the door to chaotic conflict and anarchy; to allow of its practical existence is to have a government—a State. And fortifying this necessity are the antagonisms of race, of nationalities, and of varied types of civilization, and the anarchic tendencies of human nature; above all the fatal fall, which like a deadly upas has poisoned the very fountains of our life.

The State in idea, as thus rooted in our very nature, cannot be said to be of human invention, any more than we can trace to human origin the gift of speech, or of any of the faculties which Deity has willed to man. Nor can it be called the result of choice, or convention, inasmuch as the necessities for the State's existence lie beyond the control of the volition of any single individual, or of the collective masses, which constitute the State. Its origin is divine.

The variety of forms, which government, like language, in the history of the race has assumed, excludes the idea that any one has a special and exclusive divine sanction. Nor has revelation lent the seal of its imprimatur to royalty, aristocracy, republicanism, or democracy. Knowing that governments, although of divine origin, must be mediated through human agencies, and reasoning from the equality of all men in right before the law, and the equality of obligation resting on them, we might justly infer, that that government is most founded in natural right and justice, which derives all its powers from the people. And if the people be the source and fountain of authority, that State best meets the logical requirements of the premises, whose organic law is the product of the people; one which designates the mode of its own modification by the people, and refers at stated intervals the affairs of State, and of the men who conduct them, to the arbitrament of the people. And is not this our own American Constitution? Master-piece of political art! Long may it survive the attacks of faction,

revolution and rebellion, the insidious wiles of demagogues, and the syren allurements of peculation, and official corruption.

But aside from theory, history record, show power, conferred as the reward of merit, has by its skilful exercise been perpetuated to its lineage; how prescription and popular affection have fortified the claim; how, opportunities improved, potentates, kingly or aristocratic, have seized, and with a firm and steady hand, have held the reins of government; how an ignorant and ignoble populace have acquiesced in their own disfranchisement; how a sturdy yeomanry, at times by an alliance with the monarch, and at others with a feudal aristocracy, inspired by a lofty feeling of personal independence, and intense individuality, the outgrowth of that sense of personal dignity, developed by the Christian doctrine of men's equality and personal accountability, have fought and conquered their way to participation in the government, and worked out the problem of constitutional liberty under the very forms of monarchy; how peoples thus educated, driven by religious persecution, or seeking to better their condition, have brought across the Atlantic this majestic type of civilization to then inhospitable wilds, and inspired by a sense of a lofty destiny, and impelled by a terrible energy and an unconquerable will, free from the influence and the control of an aristocracy, favored by the protection which distance lent against kingly power, and availing themselves of the opportunities afforded by European political complications, have ushered in the glories of American Republican institutions; how the new world reacting on the old, a British constituency have demanded, and have been gradually receiving, an enlargement of the privileges of the elective franchise; how a liberal and enlightened public opinion is becoming more potential in English politics, and how, as the result, a pensioned and pampered civil ecclesiastical establishment, alien to the Irish nation, now hangs trembling in the balance, before the majestic presence of the British people.

And history also records, how another people, zealous of their independence, and imbued with deep instincts of popular

liberty, have endeavored to imitate the American example, and how, fickle and unstable of purpose, not distinguishing properly between liberty and license, nor knowing the golden mean, in which liberty accords with law, their social fabric rotten at the core, and the national conscience poisoned by the virus of infidelity, have passed through successive bloody revolutions, alternating between despotism and spasmodic efforts for liberty, and how, wearied of effort, and in disgust, to save themselves from themselves, by deliberate election, almost to unanimity, they have surrendered their political birthright, patrimony and fortune, to Napoleon III., for the benefit of himself and his dynasty. History thus fortifies that principle of international jurisprudence, which admits established powers into the family of nations, whate'er may be the occasion or the causes of their origin, or their title to legitimacy, and both accord with that precept of inspired wisdom, "the powers, *that be*, are ordained of God."

The State, thus mediately of divine origin, and immediately the result of human forces, what has been the compass of its powers, what the circle of its operations, and the extent of its influence, and what the offerings and trophies it has laid upon the altar of civilization?

This corporate existence—the State—what is it? Foregoing scientific definition, let it be answered, that we best may know what the State is, in the light of what it does, and that greater clearness of perception may be secured, if in connection we consider what the State does not do. Analysis and elimination are well-known mental processes in ascertaining truth.

The State, as against the individuals subject to its sovereignty, exists in its assumed right to command and the power to enforce obedience. As such, it may take the form of an irresponsible and absolute despotism, unlimited by law or constitution, and holding all property, all lives, all acts, and all opinions, subject to the caprice of the sovereign will. The individual then becomes the slave of the State.

Recognizing in nature certain fixed rules of right and wrong, the State, advancing, may resolve to be governed by established

laws, but there being no limit to its power to enact them, it still involves at least the theoretic possibility of an unlimited disposal of the fortunes, lives, acts, and opinions of its subjects, establishing a Theocracy, and entering with an eastern espionage into all the secret recesses of human life. The individual may still be made the slave of the State.

Recognizing the marked classification of functions in the administration of the laws as Legislative, Judicial, and Executive, the sovereign will may in wisdom consent to a division of its powers, or be compelled by circumstance to share them, and when such division becomes the established order, we have presented the rudiments of a constitution, and an embryo system of checks, and balances, whose complete adjustment becomes the perfection of political wisdom. A check is thus interposed to the slavery of the individual, to the capricious, or despotic will of the sovereign.

To digress, by way of episode. Scarce nineteen centuries ago, when Greece, the land of song, poetry and art, the fond child of beauty, the home of scholars, orators, and philosophers, and yet upon whose altars even within the shades of the Academy was seen that strange inscription, "to the unknown God:" whose petty yet puissant forces drove back the hordes of eastern despotism, and yet whose weak democracies succumbed to the power of imperial Rome, and yet triumphant in their humiliation imparted to their conquerors their richest legacies, and a lofty ambition to emulate their excellence; when Rome, whose people were the representatives of valor, law, order, and executive ability, had become the mistress of the then known world, and from the gates of Hercules to the Indian Ocean the Roman Eagles were supreme, and yet in whose Pantheon at her capital were inscribed the names of the gods of all nations; after Julius Cesær, after standing as candidate for Pontifix Maximus, had on Pharsalia's field in the gage of battle wagered with Pompey the empire of the world, in the midst of a peculiar and selected people, whose bleak and uninviting hills afforded no protecting ramparts against the cupidity of Rome, and who, though conquered and dispersed, yet in the existence

of their nationality, are strongest proofs of inspired prophecy, even in the manger at Bethlehem was born a lowly Nazerene. In the years of his maturity he went about doing good; he taught the people; he worked miracles and wonders; the rage of his enemies consigned him to crucifixion, when in the language of the most bitter of his foes "He died like a God." Having finished his work, he commissioned his disciples, appointing some apostles, and some prophets, with the divine injunction, "Lo all power is given me in heaven and in earth: Go ye therefore, and teach all nations." And all nations were taught, even from Britain to the Indus, and a new society, with a divinely commissioned priesthood, claimed to maintain an independent existence within the very bosom of the Roman Empire, and through bloody persecution, by faith and good works, persevered on, until the cross found a protecting ægis in the labarum of the Cæsars. Betimes barbarism threatened civilization, and civilization took refuge in the Church, and the Church at all times by precept, mandate, and anathema, asserted the independence, and the superiority of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, and for ages feudal lords and monarchs became practically the subject satraps of the Roman Pontiff.

But to return to the point of our digression. Constitutional government, even in embryo, what a blessing to mankind! And how, its sweets once tasted, have its blessings been extended, until the very names of magna charta, the right of trial by jury, the privileges of habeas corpus, freedom of opinion and of the press, civil and religious liberty, are to English and American ears as household words. Civil liberty: the participation of the citizen in the government, running through all gradations from the most partial, to that last state of complete enfranchisement, in which all men enjoy an equality of political and legal right, without respect of condition, race, or nationality; Religious liberty: the last definition of the relation the State sustains to the Church, the complete independence of each in their respective spheres, in which the spiritual, whilst not foregoing its superior claims, seeks to influence and

control the temporal by purely spiritual agencies; civil and religious liberty: conceived in the womb of the mediæval period, twin offspring of the Reformation, and full grown in the bosom of our later Protestant civilization. In their light may not the successors of the Gregories yet learn by happy, though forced experience, that no diminution of spiritual supremacy, and no loss of power to a great ecclesiastical establishment, will follow the loss of their temporal possessions.

What are the relative influences of these varied types of the State upon human progress? Granting that the State is the product of the forces of the civilization of its epoch, it must also be remembered, that the State exerts a reflex influence upon civilization. The extent of that influence depends upon the State, the operative force on the one hand, the extent and limitations of its powers, its goodness and wisdom in devising means, and its vigor in their application, and upon the people, the subject on the other, their native tendencies, capacities, capabilities and susceptibilities. Cursorily, for the vastness of the theme, and the time alloted to this address, will not allow of more, it may be remarked.

Despotism is the embodiment of powers. Inert and pliant masses are generally its subjects. Its limitations and correctives are revolutions only. Great in proportion to its powers are its opportunities and capacities for good, and equally great are the barriers it may oppose to progress. The nation without the recuperative power, which self-political discipline involves, is at the mercy of its rulers. Great, good, and wise men may elevate the nation to great achievements, to glory and renown. Weak, ignorant, and vicious rulers, ignoble sons of noble sires, may squander and despoil the fair inheritance.

In France, in an age of disorder, violence and tumult, reigned the illustrious Charlemagne. The semi-barbarism of the Frank was still in process of fusing with the expiring life of Gallico-Roman civilization. To the conflict of languages, customs, laws and nationalities, were added the strifes of petty yet warlike feudatory chiefs. Mohammedanism in Spain, and Teutonic Heathenism in Germany, both upon his borders, were pressing upon

the outposts of Christian civilization. History informs us, how in a long life, which necessity impelled to arms, he conquered and Christianized the Saxon, repelled the Avar, the Hun, and the Saracen, and extended the limits of an empire, which his valor had established. His great genius, far in advance of his age, conceived the idea of establishing the foundations of his kingdom upon imperishable foundations, by repressing the pride and power of the nobility, and elevating the masses, by improving and systematizing the laws, by constructing great internal improvements, by founding schools, and calling to his court the learned and wise of other nations, by encouraging letters, and by patronizing the clergy, and stimulating them to greater zeal, piety and devotion. His domains were dismembered by the weakness of his successors, but his works lived after him. The nations of Central Europe had been rescued from barbarism, and the schools which he founded, grew into the universities, "which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries spread the light of intellectual development over the whole of Western Europe." His reign formed an epoch in civilization.

Russia, the last of the present Christian nations emerging from barbarism, the embodiment of the capacities of the Sclavonic race, and the representative of the Greek Church, has been rapidly and steadily conducted forward, in the career of progress, by the far-seeing and energizing wisdom of successive illustrious Czars. Her varied peoples, rapidly being moulded to the type of the Pan-Sclavonic nationality, have been christianized, civilized and educated. The boundaries of her empire, embracing seventy millions of people, extend from the Baltic to the Straits of Bhering, dividing her from our now northwestern American possessions. Internal improvements are rapidly connecting and consolidating her vast and widely separated limits. Philanthropy has abolished serfdom, and although Poland is a dark spot on her national escutcheon, should not Americans be proud of the sympathies, as they will ever witness with pleasure the growth and advancement of all the Russias? Her great arm may yet solve the enigma of the existence of those Eastern peoples, who with great arts and sciences

for ages, are yet destitute of the elements of progress, and the fixedness and despotism of whose institutions, whilst the products of the national character, serve but to confirm and perpetuate their stationary immobility. With menacing crouch she surveys the sick man in Turkey, prepared to throttle the last support of Mohammedanism, and of its civilization—a civilization, the hollowness of whose pretensions has only been demonstrated, after having contended through ages with Christian Europe for the mastery in a struggle, whose very issue trembled in the balance. The *rôle* Russia will play in the adjustment of the conflicting claims of the three main branches of the Christian Church, the future only can disclose, but that it will be great, may justly be inferred from her power.

Spain is a most noted example of the influence exerted upon the civilization of a nation by a government, whose people have not shared its cares and their incident discipline. Spain was once the arbiter of the destinies of Europe. Her resisting arm withstood the further progress of Protestantism. Great was her wealth: celebrated were her universities and extended were the limits of her empire. Her aggressive policy founded, protected and maintained distant colonies. It was the Spain of the sixteenth century: the age of Charles V. and Philip II. The seventeenth century witnessed her decline; the ignorance, weakness and imbecility of her rulers; the general impoverishment; the loss of her possessions, and her national humiliation in the dismemberment of her Empire.

To add to our observations in reference to the influence of despotic governments, it may be said, and if time permitted, illustrated by example, that a despotism, if progressive, is generally in advance of its people, leads, conducts, stimulates and moulds and exerts the greater influence in changing their manners, customs and opinions. It is the youthful stage of national life, which, in accordance with all the analogies of life, most requires, and is most susceptible of discipline.

Constitutional provisions may be considered as limitations of the excessive or wrong exercise of power, or of that mode of its exercise, ordinarily calculated to lead to dangerous results.

Hence the muniments thrown around the right of property, the privileges of habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, the division of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers, and others of like character, which may all be dismissed with the remark, that their good offices in the progress of mankind may be best appreciated, as the experience, of the bad effects their absence witnessed, and of the good results their presence has secured, has demonstrated their necessity.

Constitutional provisions may also be considered as limitations of the encroachments of the State upon the liberties of individual, or in other words, as enlargements of individual liberty. And thus we have opened that prolific source of struggle between the general power of the State and individual liberty; between a theory, which assumes that man should always remain in a state of pupilage, and can never rise above it: that individual right cannot be subordinate to the general right, except in a state of obedience in all things, and the doctrine, that there are certain matters which men should be permitted and taught to regulate for themselves: that men should be educated to the capacity of self individual government, and that such education is possible. And has not this been the very struggle of the ages? Governments there have been, and still are, which have sought to exercise a surveillance and an espionage over all the affairs of men. Knowing that opinions and ideas are powers, kings have muzzled and exercised censorship over speech, and the press. Learning that the theories of philosophic schools have become potential forces, permeating all the avenues of life, upturning the old foundations, reconstructing the social fabric, and becoming the very heart and centre of a new civilization, affecting manners and customs, morals and laws, potentates have sought to hold subject to their will, the learning of the schools and the professor's chair. Religious dogma, as an element in man's religious life, in which lie imbedded the strongest motives, incentives, impulses and mainsprings to human action, must be formulated by the State. Hence proscription for opinion's sake; hence servile professors, to teach ingenuous youth, anxiously awaiting the kingly nod or

smile; hence the horrors of the inquisition, the dungeon, and the stake, and bloody persecution for religion's sake. Would that the dark page could be erased from the history of the race. Bitter are the lessons of experience. Through scenes like these men rose to a higher wisdom. Toleration of religious belief became the practice of all civilized States; freedom of opinion and of speech became imbedded in the English Constitution, and full civil and religious liberty the birth-right of the American citizen. And thickly clustering around them are all other individual rights, fortified by the general political dogma, which allows the greatest possible individual liberty compatible with the public good. This lesson learned by inductive experience, we now may think, might well, long ages before, have been the teaching of *a priori* reasoning.

This enlargement of the personal independence and individual liberty of the subject, what blessings it has showered upon mankind! It has diminished the feeling of pauper dependence on the State, and cultivated the sentiment of manly independence and self-reliance. It has diminished the abject servility of the subject, and increased true dignity and manly self-respect. It has multiplied the motives and incentives to labor, and diversified the field of human industry. It has stimulated the mind to research and thought, and lent to intellectual activity the zeal of self-induced and spontaneous effort.

> "Lured by its charms, man sits and learns to trace
> The midnight wanderings of the orbs of space,
> Boldly he knocks at wisdom's inmost gate,
> With nature counsels, and communes with fate."

Man has traversed the field of all science, inquiry, and investigation, questioning at times, perhaps with too irreverential spirit, old and established opinions, and unsettling the old foundations. Truth and error have both been subjected to the ordeal of its scrutiny. And from the seething crucible truth has been extracted, purified by the very errors it has left behind, until the problem has been fully demonstrated, that truth need have no fear in the equal contest with error, and that error must pass from the minds of men, as truth is left free to

combat it. It has diminished the bitternesss and rancor of religious controversy, and cast more and more the mantle of charity over dogmatic strife. It has been the practical fulfillment in the world's life of the precept of St. Augustine, "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas." It has opened up the fountains of private charity, establishing by private munificence hospitals, colleges and universities, and affording the unprecedented example of immense ecclesiastical establishments, supported by voluntary contribution. It has given to each State that variety, versatility, spontaneity and activity, that absence of barren uniformity and sameness, constituting a many-sided State, which in each State, as well as in the collective States of Europe and America, constitute the crowning excellencies of modern civilization.

And allied with, and underlying this individualism in the State, is the people's participation in the government, elevating to the surface a new power, of modern growth and unknown before, and yet most potent lever, the power of public opinion. Participation in the government itself becomes a vast educational discipline, accustoming the people to analyze and examine the social, political, and moral questions, growing out of the affairs of State, preparing them readily to detect and expose wrong and injustice, and devise the appropriate remedy, doing away, to some extent at least, with blood and civil strife as the remedies for wrong, and presenting the spectacle of order and stability combined with progress, and of a State based upon the interests, the sympathies, and affections of its subjects, in which not power but affection, not loyalty but patriotism,

> "Not high-raised battlements, or labored mound,
> Thick wall, or moated gate,"

but the intelligence and virtue of the people, are the safeguards and bulwark of the nation. And thus in man's advancement have been elevated the tribunal of appeal, and the standard of redress. The address to the logic and conscience has supplanted the wager of battle; the mild triumphs of peace have succeeded to war's stern alarums; the golden age has followed the ages of bronze and of iron, and educated public opinion

becomes the power, which moulds and controls the destinies of States, which makes kings to tremble at their plans of projected wrong, and which omnipresent, all-pervading, and all-powerful, courses like the very life-blood through the veins and arteries of the civilization of the nineteenth century.

Passing from a comparison of the relative influences of the varied types of the State, let us advance to an examination of the special office, which the State discharges, among the collective forces of a progressive civilization.

The State is the embodiment of order as opposed to anarchy. Under its protection the husbandman sows his seeds, the manufacturer plies the spindle or the anvil, and the merchant sells his wares or spreads the white sails of commerce; each secure in the fruits of his industry and toil. Accumulated wealth is preserved and transmitted, to minister to the general weal, and for the benefit of succeeding ages. Teachers of all classes, without let or hindrance from the hand of violence, in quiet follow their vocations. The pictured canvass, the stately shaft, and the speaking marble, look down through the ages, so that successive generations of men may gaze at the ideals of art and beauty, and drink in inspirations of love, valor, fortitude, patriotism and religion. The treasures of learning, committed to the keeping of the written or the printed page, become the common property of all times, all tongues and all peoples. Ensamples of pious deeds live in the transmitted and perpetuated memories of saints, martyrs and apostles. Thus age ministers and speaks to age, and across the expanse of time, in the jargon of tongues, nationalities, conflicting systems of thought and antagonistic creeds, is realized the conception of a common brotherhood, a common origin, and a common destiny, in which the race, toiling and striving, creating and defending, preserving and transmitting, at last realizes the conception of its utmost possible development. And through all the scenes of the mighty drama, amid the multitude of actors, the State in its permissive sanction, its defensive action, and its aggressive movements, is recognized as the guardian and protector of civilization.

To its negative character as protector, the State adds its

positive contributions to civilization. It stimulates, encourages and rewards industry, skill, and inventive genius. It opens up and maintains the highways of communication between communities and nations, itself a great civilizer. It orginates, builds, and completes great internal improvements. In more modern legislation it grants to corporate bodies great franchises, shared from its sovereignty, to develop earth's hidden wealth, to facilitate internal and external commerce, to stretch the wire and lay the rail, almost annihilating time and bringing distant places near. Individual enterprise and associated power are thus combined. It adds to the corporate franchises of the Pacific Railroad Company munificent contributions from the national wealth, to enable it to cross vast and desert plains, to tunnel and scale lofty mountain chains and ranges, to bridge and span a continent, to connect the peoples and civilizations of the Atlantic shore and of the Pacific slope, to change the highway of the commerce of the world and the pathway of nations, and to form the last connecting link in the course of civilization, as westward from the Orient it circles round the globe—a monument to the splendid enterprise, untiring energy, and unconquerable will of the American people, and the far-seeing wisdom of their government.

The State has been the patron of art, literature and culture. It has founded and maintained colleges and universities, which, overgrown with the moss of ages, have been, and still are, vast powers in the State and Church, and most potent forces in promoting, stimulating, elevating, humanizing, cosmopolitanizing and christianizing the civilization of the age. It founded and carried forward the Prussian school system, more potent, even at the desperate yet decisive struggle at Sadowa, than the needle-gun, in deciding the destinies of Prussia. It established the system of American common schools, educating the millions, and preparing them wisely and intelligently to administer the government. May ecclesiasticism not carp at, or seek to mar its fair proportions! The common schools teach but the alphabet of science. Our civilization is essentially Christian. The churches have all the liberties, and means, and opportunities, for

the moral and religious culture and instruction of all the people. And if to our colleges, whether purely scientific and literary, or patronized by religious denominations, and intended to combine intellectual and religious culture, and by a vast synthesis to teach the philosophy of the relations of all science, physical, mental, moral and divine, the highest type of education, and all now supported by private liberality and religious charity, were added support from the State, the friends of learning and religion would have reason to thank their legislators. It would be the combination of individual zeal, love of learning, benevolence and charity, with the State power and associated strength, according with the genius of our legislation, and the most, which, in the division of religious sects, and under the theory of our institutions, we would have either the right or the reason to expect.

The State in the administration of the laws, quietly and almost imperceptibly, because gradually, exerts a vast influence in changing the manners and customs of a people. Its laws are rules of human action, enjoining right and forbidding wrong. Its application of the general provisions of the statute, or of its collective body of principles, by judicial decision, to the endless variety of human action, gives rise to jurisprudence, a science and a system ever changing with the varied circumstances of successive ages, ever growing, and yet never to be perfected, except with the end of time. It embraces a code of morals, not as comprehensive indeed as the ethics of the schools. It cannot pry into the secret recesses of the human heart, and it more especially defines man's duties as a citizen. But the model citizen, who lives up to the spirit in which the laws do have their birth, may well be called a model man. This code, with its avenging sword, it ever holds up to the minds and consciences of men. But this code has been the growth of time. Like people, like laws, is the well-known adage. A barbarous race will most ordinarily have a cruel and a bloody code. The law changes with the change of manners and customs, and the laws in their turn change the manners and customs of a people. Only can a wrong, cruel or immoral custom be com-

pletely and effectually extirpated, as the law by its prohibitions and penalties, according with the moral sense of the nation, banishes it forever from the presence of Society. But we would not overrate the influence of the State in this regard. Although the knowledge of the right is an essential to virtuous action, knowledge furnishes not the tendency nor the impulse of the heart, from which all deeds both good and bad do flow. The State wisely leaves the purification of the heart and conscience to other hands.

In our American epoch the State has left the vast fields of morals, religious cultus, discipline, and creed, to the Churches. She recognizes their heaven-born prerogatives, and guarantees their immunity in the State and National Constitutions. She leans upon their supporting arm, and feels their reacting influence, as by their systems, they promote among the people a nobler virtue, purer morals, and a more elevated and devoted piety.

The State exerts her external power in founding and maintaining colonies, the pregnant germs of new States and nationalities, thus spreading the light and life of civilization, to the darkest corners of the earth. At times the State rises to the height of a great colossal world-power, aggressive and conquering, like Rome of old, embracing and holding under sway, with the tenacious grasp of high governing ability, many tongues and peoples, that in the wake of the conquests of her eagles, under Providence, might the more readily follow the peaceful, yet more enduring, triumphs of the cross. In modern times the reveille of the English drum precedes the rising god of day in his circle round the globe, and it has been said that upon the possessions of Britain the sun never rises nor sets. Her world-encircling dependencies are the channels, through which the nations may learn the lessons of English law, of English order and stability, and yet of English progress, of English constitutional liberty, and through which feeble and sickly nationalities may be raised to the level of a better, because a Christian civilization. England, notwithstanding thy many acts of wrong oppression, and injustice, "with all thy faults I love thee still!"

In case of conflicting tendencies in society, whose divergence and antagonism become such, that their common continued existence becomes impossible in the same political community, the State at times becomes the arbiter of their rival claims, lending its strong arm to the one, to supplant the other. Thus was it in our late civil strife. The war of the rebellion has already passed into history, and in the light of her lessons, teaching by example, we can now see, what we scarcely realized before, that the struggle was the collision of two antagonistic types of civilization. The Free States were the more strongly marked democratic communities, with a more minute subdivision of landed estates, a more even distribution of wealth and more general participation in the comforts of life, more equality, more general intelligence, and the consequent more enlarged political power among the masses. The late Confederate States were the homes of a powerful landed slave aristocracy, giving rise to different customs, habits of thought, opinions and laws. Side by side the two systems developed their legitimate results, leading to greater differences and divergence, disrupting social and commercial ties, the churches, and both the old political parties of the nation, until two peoples, although of one race, tongue and religion, were rapidly becoming distinct nationalities, with characteristics as marked as those of the modern Englishman or Frenchman. The philosophic mind of Vice-President Stephens therefore correctly saw, and he accordingly proclaimed, that slavery must be made the corner-stone of the Confederate Government, and the lamented Lincoln—peace be to his ashes—rose to the height of the great argument, when following the popular instincts, and yet wisely in advance of the general opinion of his times, true to his intuitions, rather than led by logical and philosophic processes of thought, he availed himself of the great occasion, and issued the immortal proclamation, striking the shackles from the slave, and inaugurating the blessings and glories of universal emancipation. His soul in utter darkness was erranded from earth by

> "The most arch deed of piteous massacre
> That ever yet this land was guilty of."

His mortal remains, amid the sobs of an humble and oppressed race, he had helped to elevate, and the deepest anguish of a nation, he had lived to serve, were carried to his own loved Illinois. May the winds of heaven not course roughly or rudely over his last resting place. May love and affection rear o'er it the heaven-piercing shaft, that successive generations of men, attracted thither, may learn the lessons of honor, honesty, patriotism, and true nobility. The American people will ever revere the memory, as impartial history is sure to do the fullest justice, to the fair fame of Abraham Lincoln.

And, as in a single state, so upon a more enlarged field, conflicting States, upon the embattled field, determine the destinies and fortunes of civilization. Thus was it when Mohammedanism, under the protecting wing of the aggressive and conquering Saracen, had steadily advanced its conquests and possessions along the southern shore of the Mediterranean, until crossing into Europe, it had found itself firmly entrenched in Spain. Its ambitious and aggressive policy meditated nought less than the conquest of the Christian nations of Europe, and the overthrow of Christianity itself. And dark and ominous were the times, and perilous to Christian civilization was the crisis, until on the bloody and long-contested battle-field of Tours, the strong arm of Charles Martel sent the shattered forces of Islamism reeling to their Spanish fastnesses, never more seriously to endanger the civil and religious institutions of Western Europe. And so at a later epoch, during the struggle of the thirty years war, which the pen of Schiller has so tersely and yet so graphically described, Gustavus Adolphus, the Lion of the North, saved continental Protestantism from annihilation by the combined Catholic Powers, and Catholicity and Protestantism, in the providence of God, were permitted to live on side by side, each to perform its allotted work under the bidding of the Supreme, until the appointed time shall at length arrive, when all Christians shall enjoy one faith, one hope and one baptism.

Thus, in brief and condensed outline, suggestive rather than exhaustive, have we attempted to portray the State as an element in civilization. We would not magnify its office. We know of other principalities, even the heavenly, the Church, eldest

daughter of Heaven, before whose glorious services in ennobling and elevating man, must fade all the laurels, which the achievements of the State have won. But the State is still a mighty power, and needs the services of the noblest of her sons. Proud of our democratic institutions, we are not unaware of their many short-comings and defects. Mediocrity may be affirmed of most of our public men. He, who in medicine or law would win his way to the front rank of his profession, must exhibit that strength of intellect, adapted to its needs, which time, and study, and discipline and education alone can give. Not so in the arena of politics. Gold too often paves the avenues of entrance upon the public service, and corrupt men, elected by corrupted constituencies, seek entrance, simply to enjoy the spoils they may gather there. The standard of probity, and capacity in our public servants, can only be raised by a greater degree of intelligence and virtue among all the people. The school system must be supplemented by the college and university. The higher institutions of learning must be made the great exemplars. That true nobility of soul, which a liberal culture can so well engender, should contribute to purify and ennoble the public conscience. At these higher seminaries of learning may annually many generous and gifted youths be raised to the high honors of the Baccalaureate, and may the parchment index of their advance in the liberal arts be their letters-patent of true nobility. Sons of Marshall, and of Franklin and Marshall! gird on your armor. Be not laggards in this age of enterprise, energy, munificence and gigantic effort. Liberally aid in endowing your Alma Mater. Are not a mother's tender love and care well worthy of kind and rich returns from such, as would not prove ungrateful sons? The endowment scheme in our age is no longer the special province of the State. The genius of our civilization has made it the high privilege of the citizen. May the great Anglo-German commonalty of our Commonwealth, whose lineage she is, establish the Institution, whose annual commencement we have met to celebrate, upon enduring foundations, that through the ages may flow, from her health-giving and refreshing fountains, perennial streams, to gladden and rejoice Society, the State, the Church, even the universal heritage of God.

ART. II.—AN INQUIRY INTO THE VALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM.*

BY SAMUEL H. GIESY, D.D., PHILADELPHIA.

Lay-Baptism has never formally obtained a place among the customs and usages of the Reformed Church. Even in the greatest emergencies—the "*extremæ necessitatis articulo*" of the old rubrics—there is no resort to the lay-administration of this Sacrament. Why then institute an inquiry into its validity?

In other Protestant Churches (Lutheran and Episcopal, not to name others), the validity of Lay-Baptism, in given circumstances, is recognized, and the custom to some extent still prevails. Cases may arise, have arisen, in the orderly prosecution of the ministerial office, when the responsibility of rejecting, or recognizing and ratifying a Baptism administered by lay-hands must be assumed. One such case recently occurred on the application for confirmation of a person thus baptized. The minister in charge properly proceeded with the service without

* This article was submitted as a majority report, by a Committee appointed for the purpose, to the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church, at Baltimore, Md., in October, 1867. The case which gave rise to it, was that of the Baptism of a child by its mother, when it was thought the child would not live, and no minister could be procured. When the child grew up and came forward for confirmation, the question of the validity of its Baptism came up, the mother insisting, as we believe, that it was valid. The case was referred by the pastor to the Classis, and from thence to Synod. The subject was referred to a Committee, of which Rev. S. H. GIESY, D. D., was chairman. This article is the report which the Committee submitted. At the same time, by permission, a minority report was submitted by Rev. F. W. KREMER, of Lebanon, Pa. Without adopting either report, the whole subject was referred to the next meeting of Synod, and the regular report of the Committee ordered to be printed. Under such circumstances it is hardly necessary to say, that this Review, in publishing the report, assumes no responsibility for the conclusions reached by the author, but only commends the subject as worthy of study, and its treatment, as the article abundantly shows, highly elaborate and able.—*Ed. Review.*

the re-baptism of the subject. Similar cases may occur. What is proper under such circumstances? The inquiry is neither unimportant nor yet needless.

In another view, the question is full of importance and seriousness. If the minister be of the absolute essence of the Sacrament, another question lies back of this, viz.: What constitutes a lawful minister? what is a true and valid ordination? Up to the period of the Reformation, ordination episcopally conveyed alone prevailed. With that vast theological upheaval many and great changes in church order were introduced. The Reformed branch, with one or two exceptions, threw off the episcopate as one of the intolerable corruptions of Popery. In the room of Episcopal, Presbyterial ordination came in, and with it the parity of the ministry was stoutly maintained over against the unbroken practice of the Church from the earliest, if not Apostolic, times. Without presuming to a settlement of this controverted point, its bare mention shows how intimately related it is to the subject in hand—the validity of Lay-Baptism. If Episcopal ordination be alone admissible, then all persons not thus ordained, are not ministers at all, and their acts no more than the acts of laymen. Under this form, it is not hard to see, that the question carries along with it the most serious consequences, involving the very constitution and right of existence of all the Protestant non-episcopal Churches, and, besides, affecting the Christian status and spiritual condition of millions of persons now quietly satisfying themselves with the ministrations of men unauthorized, because improperly and irregularly ordained. This reference is only made to show the scope and serious nature of this inquiry.

THE AUTHORITY FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

The Church is not a human but a divine institution. All sacramental ordinances legitimately finding place therein must stand by divine authority. It is the prerogative alone of the great Head of the Church to say what ordinances shall have perpetual force. The Sacrament of Baptism is not without such high and specific sanction. The authority for its admin-

istration proceeds directly from our blessed Lord. This is clear enough from the imperative form of the Apostolic commission: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name," &c. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. The power here bestowed upon the eleven apostles was not to end with them. They should die, but not the power with them; that was to continue, from age to age, through their successors in office, according to this promise of our Lord's perpetual presence: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The purchase of salvation was for the ends of the world, and the due means of admitting all nations into the fold of the church—the ordained order of that salvation—must never be wanting. From the commission itself this also is clear and unquestionable, that the *proper and regular* administration of Baptism is confined to persons, like the apostles originally, invested with ministerial character and authority.

THE PURPOSE OF HOLY BAPTISM.

The Church, by virtue of its divine institution, is the depository and medium of the resources of life and salvation. The Person of Christ is and must remain the original Fountain of grace; the Holy Ghost its original and efficient minister; and the Sacraments the divinely appointed method of its communication. Hence the Sacraments are not the *sources*, only the ordained and ordinary *means* of grace; not saviours nor substitutes for *the* Saviour, only the channels of the provided salvation; the sacred *mysteries* by which the grace of God meets the needs of our fallen life and "counteracts the operation of original and actual sin." Hence, although administered necessarily through human instrumentalities, they are not human but divine acts; not man's, but God's hand of salvation—His way of gracious doing to man. By them God, the sole Giver of grace, bestows, and man, in his abject poverty, receives, specific spiritual benefits—"that which by nature he cannot have." This intervening order is fully witnessed to by St. Paul, when, of the ministry in its largest sense, he says: "But

we have *this treasure in earthen vessels*, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

Calvin admits this same principle in saying: "It ought to be sufficient for us to recognize the *hand and seal* of our Lord in His Sacraments, let the administrator be who he may." Another old Reformation divine says: "For as faith is our hand by which we seek, lay hold of, and receive the blessings of the Gospel, so the Word and Sacraments are, as it were, *the hands of God*, by which he offers and presents to us, and applies and seals to all believers, the benefits procured by Christ."* Hooker speaks of grace being a donation from God *by Baptism.*† A modern Anglican divine calls the Sacraments "the media by which God co-operates with man in his endeavor after Christian life."‡

Natural generation is and must be a birth in sin. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," says our Lord most emphatically; and St. Paul reiterates the same fundamental truth in these words: "By *nature* the children of wrath." The law of sin starts with our conception, not with self-consciousness. Hence the Psalmist's confession: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Long before the human powers come to self-conscious activity, this law of sin is in operation. The law of grace must go as deep as the law of sin—must touch the very spring-head of human life. Not by the order of nature in any way, but only by the order of a supernatural grace—a new birth, a regeneration—is this possible. In Infant Baptism, the work of grace is made to precede the self-conscious activity of the child, standing thereby in a new order of life.

BAPTISM THE SACRAMENT OF THE NEW BIRTH.

It is definitely called so by our Lord Himself, in His conversation with Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water

---

* Gerhard's Theo. Inst.

† Hooker's Eccl. Polity. Book V., § 62.

‡ Directorium Pastorale, Rev. John Henry Blunt, p. 158, London.

and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 5. It is not to be denied that Christ associates here the birth of the Spirit with the birth of water, or Holy Baptism. Why this peculiar association is made, is no concern of ours. The fact is all we have to do with; and what, in this way, God has joined together, no man has a right to put asunder. That by "water" here our Lord refers to Baptism was, up to a comparatively recent period, the universally accepted interpretation of the passage, carrying with it the authority of the most learned and orthodox commentators, from the earliest ages on down.* St. Paul further testifies to Baptism being the Sacrament of the new birth, when he calls it *διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*—the bath of the new birth, or the "washing of regeneration." Titus iii. 5. There can be no doubt that this Pauline conception of Baptism—the actual translation of the subject from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of Christ—was the full and firm faith of the early Church. The ancient Fathers are all one here. No one can read them at all thoughtfully without being thoroughly convinced of this; for this thought—a new birth in the Sacrament of Baptism—is continually repeating itself in their writings.

Take a few passages from those early Christian writers, implying a new birth in that Sacrament. Many others are furnished in Wall's exhaustive work on Infant Baptism, already referred to, and Sadler's excellent work, "The Second Adam and the New Birth."

---

*"All the ancient Christians (without the exception of one man) so understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, of Baptism. All that mention that text, from Justin Martyr (A. D. 148) down to St. Austin, (A. D. 430) do so apply it. Neither did I ever see it otherwise applied in any ancient writer. I believe Calvin was the first that ever denied this place to mean Baptism. He gives a new interpretation, which he confesses to be new. The judicious Mr. Hooker saw betimes the inconvenience and groundlessness of this new interpretation of Calvin's, which was then greedily embraced by Cartwright and others, that they might with better face deny any necessity of that private Baptism, which had been ordered by the Church in cases of extremity; and says on that account, 'I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst.'"—*Wall on Infant Baptism, Vol. I., pp.* 443–445. *Cotton's Edition.* 1862.

Justin Martyr, A. D. 148. "Then they are led by us to the water, and are regenerated by the same process of regeneration by which we were ourselves regenerated; for they then receive the laver in the water in the name of God the Father and Master of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ says, 'Unless ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"

Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 192. "He seems to me to form man of the dust, to regenerate him by water, to make him grow by His Spirit, to instruct him by His word."

Tertullian, A. D. 200. "When with this law is compared that limitation, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God,' this hath bound down faith to the necessity of Baptism."

Origen, A. D. 210. "And because, through the Sacrament of Baptism, the pollutions of our earthly origin are removed, so it is, also, that infants are baptized; for, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit,'" &c.

Cyprian, A. D. 248. "For then may they at length be fully sanctified, and become sons of God, if they be born of each Sacrament, since it is written, 'Except a man be born of water,'" &c.

Ambrose, A. D. 397. "Nor, again, does the mystery of regeneration take place without water; for, 'Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit,'" &c.

Augustine, A. D. 430. "No man passes from the first man to the second man except through the Sacrament of Baptism. In children born, and not yet baptized, let Adam be recognized. In children born and baptized, and on this account born again, let Christ be recognized."

These passages—and it would be quite an easy matter to multiply them—from the early Fathers, expressing so clearly their view of the significance and necessity of Baptism, will account for the great stress they put on its actual administration, and that general anxiety in regard to it which, at a very early period, led to the custom of Lay-Baptism in cases of extreme peril to life. In his work on Primitive Christianity, Cave

says: "This custom, without question, arose from an opinion they had of the absolute and indispensable necessity of Baptism, without which they scarce thought a man's future condition could be safe, and therefore it was better it should be had from any one than to depart this life without it."

Further, Baptism is the Sacrament of incorporation into Christ. *Gal. iii.* 27, *Rom. vi.* 3, 4. It is the Sacrament for the remission of sins. *Acts ii.* 38, *xxii.* 18, *Eph.v.* 26. "When the last clauses were added to the Nicene Creed by the Council of Constantinople, in the year 381, one was included which declares, 'I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.' The meaning of this clause may be shown by paraphrasing it: 'I acknowledge one Baptism, administered once only to each person, and only in one manner (that is with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost), to be efficacious for the pardon of all sins,—original sin in infants, original and actual in adults.'"* And this still remains the mind of the Church wherever the sacramental sense of the Gospel is not obscured or wholly obliterated by a different system.

Baptism is the Sacrament of incorporation into the Church, the mystical body of Christ—the initial ordinance. *Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Βαπτίζοντες. Matt. xxviii.* 19. 1 *Cor. xii.* 13. The Heidelberg Catechism follows in this same pure sense of the Gospel, when it says, in answer to *Question* 74, "Are infants also to be baptized? Yes, for since . . . . . they must therefore, *by Baptism*, as a sign of the covenant, be also *admitted* into the Christian Church." The old German text is, "durch den tauff der Christlichen Kirchen *eingeleibt;*" the modern German reads, "durch die Taufe der Christlichen Kirche *einverleibt;*" the Latin, "per Baptismum Ecclesiæ Dei *inserendi sunt;*" to which the English, "by Baptism *incorporated*," or as the new translation (Tercentenary Edition) has it, "*ingrafted* into the Christian Church," answers most nearly. From all this it follows that "the grace given in

---

* *Sacraments and Sacramental Ordinances, Rev. John Henry Blunt, p.* 72.

Baptism places the person baptized in a new relation to God; being accounted His child by spiritual adoption as well as natural creation, and receiving spiritual as well as natural gifts from Him."*

THE CONDITIONAL NECESSITY OF BAPTISM.

Salvation is ordinarily through the divine order of grace. The Sacraments are for man, not God; they bind us, not Him. God binds us to the ordinances, but Himself remains unbound —omnipotent, if He will, in the sphere of grace as well as nature. But it is clear enough from the Scripture, that God has associated salvation with Baptism. There are no less than twelve passages where this association is brought out in a direct and positive form.† The unbiassed consideration of these passages forces the candid student of the Divine Word to the conclusion so tersely put by Hooker: "*The law of Christ tieth all men to receive Baptism.*" It is not to be doubted that this firm belief in the necessity of Baptism, as a condition precedent for salvation, fixed itself very early in the mind of the Church, and led to the authorization of its administration, in necessitous cases, even on the part of the laity.

We are now prepared to pass over to the consideration of the

ESSENTIALS OF A TRUE AND VALID BAPTISM.

On this point Maskell makes this observation in his able and learned work on Holy Baptism: "The validity of the Sacrament, as regards its essentials, must depend upon the same particulars at all times; that once instituted by our blessed Lord, it cannot be changed or altered in any necessary detail whatsoever, by authority less than His. And this, whether by addition or by diminution."‡ From the institution of the Sacra-

---

* *Directorium Pastorale, Rev. John Henry Blunt, p.* 158.

† St. John iii. 3, 5; St. Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38, 39; xxii. 16; Rom. vi. 1–4; 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27; Gal. iii. 26, 27; Eph. v. 25, 26; Col. ii. 12; Titus iii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 21.

‡ *Holy Baptism. By Rev. W. Maskell. p.* 121. *London.*

ment, three things enter absolutely into its essence and integrity —*the proper matter, its actual application, and the proper form.* Gerhard, standard Lutheran authority, holds this language: "As a whole, the parts of Baptism which pertain to its essence are three, which can neither be sundered, nor changed, to wit, *the water, the word, and the act.*"* In this he only follows the previous statement of St. Augustine.

At first sight, it might appear wholly unnecessary to say anything with regard to the *proper matter* of Baptism. The frequency with which water is mentioned in this connection, one might suppose would have forever settled the point, both as to the absolute necessity of water being used in the administration of the Sacrament, and as to water, and water only, being the proper matter. But very early in the history of the Church, it was found necessary to insist on the absolute use of water, since, in a metaphorical interpretation of the Scriptures, water-baptism was, in some cases, repudiated, and, besides, wine, vinegar, milk, sand and other material were sometimes substituted. Tertullian, in his treatise *De Baptismo*, mentions a sect which denied the necessity of water in this Sacrament; and Augustine charges the Manicheans with the rejection of water in the administration of Baptism, as one of their heresies. The Cathari, whom Blunt calls the Puritans of the twelfth century, substituted for water-baptism a ceremony which they called Baptism by fire. The Waldenses, too, in mistaken zeal for spiritual Baptism, ruled out altogether the necessity of water in this Sacrament. The Flagellants, a sect of the thirteenth century, so named from their peculiar faith in this particular, held that each one ought to be baptized in his own blood, *per flagella de corpore excusso.*† It is well-known that, to this day, the followers of George Fox, in their hyperspiritualism and abhorrence of all religious forms, repudiate altogether the outward ordinance, under the pretext of

---

* "In universum tres substantiales baptismi partes sint statuendæ, quæ non possunt divelli aut mutari, scilicet *aqua, verbum, et actio.*" *Gerhard's Theo. Inst.*

† *Holy Baptism, by Rev. W. Maskell, pp.* 32–35; *also "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," by Rev. John Henry Blunt, pp.* 210, 211.

holding to a spiritual Baptism. Besides, where water was not at hand, recourse has been had to wine, milk, vinegar, and, on the desert, sand, as the material of Baptism.

The *mystical sense*, always attached to the use of water for a religious purpose, goes to show its necessity to a true and valid Baptism. This association of water—ceremonial ablutions—with inward spiritual purification does not belong exclusively to the system of revealed religion. There we find it by divine appointment and under divine regulations. But nothing was more common among the heathen nations than ceremonial bathing before sacrificing. The Old Testament, however, is particularly full of such prefigurements of its sacramental virtue. We meet this mystical force of water on the very first page of Holy Writ. The creative operation of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, is directly associated with this element. "When as yet there was no living thing upon the earth," He moved upon, *i. e.*, hovered, brooded over (according to the original*), the face of the deep, and, lo, a living world starts forth from that boundless waste of waters: a type of the Sacrament of Regeneration, in which "born of *water and of the Spirit*," the dead soul becomes instinct with a new life. The holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, teaching by inspiration, do give this prefigurative sacramental sense to two remarkable occurrences recorded in the ancient Scriptures; the one† seeing in the waters of the flood, cleansing the earth of the defilement brought upon it by the inhabitants of the old world, a "figure" of the Baptismal cleansing of mankind from the filth of sin, and in the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark, a "figure" of salvation by Baptism; the other,‡ taking Israel's hasty transit through the Red Sea, separating them from the land of their long and bitter bondage, to be a type of man's deliverance by Baptism from the bondage of nature and his freedom in Christ. Showing the deepest sympathy with the apostolic meaning given to these remote events, we find

---

* Lange's Genesis, translated by Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D.

† 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. ‡ 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

this mystical view, from the earliest ages, incorporating itself into the sacramental thinking of the Church. With peculiar fitness it has been enshrined and is perpetuated, from age to age, in this old Baptismal prayer: "Who, of Thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the ark by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, Thy people, through the Red Sea, *figuring thereby Thy holy Baptism.**" Old as is this Baptismal prayer, it is, doubtless, based on this still more ancient form from the Sacramentary of Gelasius, A. D. 492: "Thou . . . . who washing away the sins of the world by water, didst, in the very outpourings of the deluge, stamp a figure of regeneration; so that through the mystery of one and the *same element*, there was both an end put to sins, and a source of excellence."

The Old Testament contains yet other instances of this mystical force of water, prefigurative of its higher sacramental use. Of special significance in this respect, because leprosy was a type of sin, is the cleansing of Naaman, when, following the direction of Elisha, "he went down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean."† What was here, in the Old Testament, in the form of prophecy and prefigurement, finds its full meaning and force in the sacramental use and cleansing virtue of water in Holy Baptism.

The sanctification of this element by our Lord's Baptism in Jordon gives, for all ages, the solemn sanction of His own blessed example. His words to Nicodemus must also be taken as an authoritative designation of the matter absolutely necessary to its administration: "Except a man be born of *water*," &c. Hence, in the absence of the proper matter and the substitution of anything else, that Baptism must be pronounced null and void.

The ruling of the Church has always been against an exclusively spiritual conception of the ordinance, and the substitu-

---

* "*Order of Worship*," *p.* 189.

† 2 Kings, v. 14.

tion of any other material than the one designated by our Lord, "baptizing with water." It is not possible to produce any liturgy, either from the Eastern or Western Church, from the earliest ages down to the present, which allowed the use, even in cases of extremity, of any other matter than water in a true and valid administration of Baptism. The Council of Trent holds this explicit language: "If any one shall say, that true and natural water is not of necessity for Baptism, and on that account shall wrest to some sort of metaphor those words of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost,' let him be anathema.*" According to the Heidelberg Catechism, the outward visible sign of Baptism is water necessarily. In Question 69, it is said, *Christ appointed* this external washing *with water*. Hence the rubric in all properly prepared liturgies, preceding the office of Baptism, directing that "*water* be provided," &c.

The proper form of Baptism has always been regarded as no less important. That the recitation of the words of the institution is necessary to the integrity of Baptism is manifest from the original commission: "Go ye . . . . baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Only that which is of God can be the bearer of the divine. Augustine says: "*Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum;*" join the word to the element and it becomes the sacrament. The word here is the authorized formula of Baptism—the plain enunciation of the three Divine Persons. The Church, by its bishops, councils, canons, has all along pronounced the distinct mention of the names of the blessed Trinity to be of the essence of a valid Baptism. Ambrose says: "Except one shall have been baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot receive the remission of sins, nor share the gift of spiritual grace."† The "venerable Bede," called so from his superior

* The canon is: "Si quis dixerit, aquam veram et naturalem non esse de necessitate baptismi, atque idea verba illa Domini nostrii Jesu Christi, *Nisi quis renatus fuit ex aqua, et Spiritu Sancto*, ad metaphoram aliquam detorserit; anathema sit."

† "Nisi baptizatus fuerit *in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, remissionem non potest accipere peccatorum, nec spiritualis gratiæ munus haurire."

piety, virtue, and protracted life, declares: "If any one baptizing says, 'I baptize you in Christ Jesus,' and does not say, 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' as the Lord instituted, it is no true Baptism."* It would be an easy matter to repeat, if that were necessary, from the Apostolical Constitutions and ancient Councils, canons like this: "If any bishop or presbyter, contrary to the ordinance of the Lord, does not baptize into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but into three unoriginated beings, or three sons, or three comforters, let him be deposed." Heretical Baptism, and as well that of persons usurping the holy office, was accepted and recognized as valid when administered in the proper form and with the proper matter.† The Council of Nice ordered the re-baptism of those only who had been baptized by the Paulianists, and so not in the name of the Trinity.‡ The rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity vitiates necessarily any service or ceremony in imitation of Christian Baptism.

The greatest stress, as appears from the history of the Church, was laid upon the use of the proper matter and the proper form of Baptism. Its validity was made dependent upon this. Archbishop Laurence of the Anglican Church says: "It was always the doctrine of the Reformation, that the element of water alone,

---

*"Si quis baptizans dicat, baptizo te in Christo Jesu; et non dicat in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, sicut Dominus instituit, non est verus baptismus."

†The Sardican Council, A. D., 347 which condemned and excommunicated Ischyras, who usurped the office of a Presbyter and then of a Bishop, did not annul the Baptisms administered by him, nor order the re-baptism of persons baptized by him either before or after his pretended consecration to the usurped Bishopric. The same Council declared null and void the ordination of all persons ordained by the pretenders Musœus and Eutychianus, and yet did not order the re-baptism of persons baptized by any of these men acting without authority and legitimate ordination. *Rev. E. Kelsall's letter to Dr. Waterland on the validity of Lay-Baptism; Waterland's Works, vol. VI., p.* 126.

‡Maskell makes this observation in his thorough discussion of the whole subject, in the work already referred to: "Where any notice is taken of the question of the Baptism of heretics, the constant rule and practice seems to have depended, whether as to receiving or rejecting it, upon the fact, on the one hand, of the true form, or, on the other, of any substitute having been used in the administration of the Sacrament." *Holy Baptism, p.* 168.

united to the form of words prescribed by our Saviour, constituted true Baptism." So much importance, indeed, was justly attached to this, that, lest in the fear and haste consequent upon its administration in a case of extremity, there might be some damaging omission or substitution, the Book of Common Prayer, in its office for private Baptism of children, directs the parish-priest to make the following inquiries touching any Baptism he may be required to recognize and allow: "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With what *words* was this child baptized?"

The third essential of a true and valid administration of Baptism, is *the actual application of the water* in the plain use of the words of the institution. Gerhard, in his "*Theo. Inst.*," styled by Kurtz the *opus palmare* of Lutheran Theology, says: "It is not sufficient that the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit should be invoked upon the water of Baptism, but it is also required that the person should be put into the water, or have the water poured upon him; so, on the other hand, it does not suffice to put the person in water, or pour it upon him, but it is required that this should be done in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."*

Just at this point comes in the consideration of the proper administrator of the Sacrament. Who may lawfully make the application of water in Baptism? There can be, and has been, no dispute that only a person who has been duly clothed with the ministerial office is the *proper and lawful* administrator of Baptism, and indispensable to its *regular*, though not its *valid*, administration. To the Apostles, and to them only, and their successors, down through the ages, was it with divine authority said: "Go *ye*, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing," &c. By our blessed Lord, the administration of Baptism with the office of teaching is committed to a class of persons especially

---

* Non sufficet, invocari nomen Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti super aquam baptismi, sed requiritur etiam, ut homo in aquam mergatur, sive aqua perfundatur; vicissim non sufficet, hominem in aquam mergere, vel aqua perfundere, sed requiritur, ut hoc fiat in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. *Gerhard's Theo. Inst. Cap. VI.*, § 88. *Tuburgæ*, 1769.

called and ordained to the sacred work. St. Paul reiterates the same thing in 1 Cor. iv. 1, where he styles the ministers of Christ, "the *stewards* of the mysteries of God,"—*οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων Θεοῦ*, which the Vulgate renders, *dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.* It is not to be denied that, ordinarily and regularly, the administration of Baptism pertains alone to the ministers of the Church, *ex officio.*

The question before us, however, is not as to its *regular* administration, but its *validity*, *when*, *under necessitous circumstances*, *it is irregularly administered*, i. e., by a person not in holy orders. The validity and regularity of Baptism are separate and distinct questions, and ought not to be confounded. The question to be decided is this: Is the administration of Baptism absolutely tied to the Minister: like the proper matter and the proper form, is the minister of the *absolute essence** of the Sacrament, and is its assumption on the part of an unordained person, even in necessitous cases, *in periculo mortis*, so gross a violation of order as to vitiate the act itself, and render re-baptism necessary? Sacredly guarding against its unwarranted and uncalled for administration on the part of others, the constant practice of the Church, with some few exceptional cases, has been all one way. Broadly asserting the *irregularity* of necessitous baptism by laymen, it has boldly maintained, by authoritative deliverances and the steady refusal of re-baptism to all such, the *validity* of the act where the proper matter was

---

* If the minister be absolutely *essential* to its validity, then a strict construction of the great commission, "*Go ye*," &c., would have confined its administration to the *Apostolic* rank. Yet the Primitive Church did not so confine it, but suffered, in cases of emergency, Presbyters and Deacons, even without the formal permission of the *Bishops* to baptize, thus furnishing precedents of its *valid* administration where the degree of holy orders did not originally comprehend it. "To make the minister *essential* to true Baptism," says Kelsall in his reply to Dr. Waterland, "is to teach a doctrine which is altogether new, is countenanced by none of the ancient Fathers, is contradicted by some, and is disclaimed by the known practice of the Primitive Church." *Waterland's Works, Vol. VI., p* 103. "Ministrantis personam non de *esse* sacramenti, sed de *bene esse* judicarunt. Pie igitur fit, si minister tangat solus; at fit etiam, si tangat alius." *Archbishop Abbot.* In this the Archbishop only follows the theory held by St. Augustine, who made the essence of the Sacraments to consist in the application of the water with the proper form, by whomsoever done.

at hand, the proper form observed, and the element actually applied. This it has done without abating in the least the intervening character of the sacred ministry, but defending it alone on the ground of necessity, and the practice of the old Testament Church in regard to circumcision, the appointed initiatory Sacrament into that Church, performed even by women in several instances.* "The rules of the Church," says Bingham, "required that none should baptize in *ordinary cases*, but the regular and lawful ministers of the Church; and to do otherwise was always a note of criminal schism: but in *case of extremity*, she granted a general commission even to laymen to baptize, rather than any person in such an exigence should die without Baptism; and in such a case to receive Baptism from a layman, was neither usurpation nor schism in the giver or receiver, because they had the Church's authority for the action."† Touching the validity of irregular Baptisms, Hooker, in his quaint way of putting things, says: "Many things are firm, being done, although in part done otherwise than positive rigor and strictness did require. Nature, as much as is possible, inclineth unto validities and preservations: dissolutions and nullities of things done, are not only not favored, but hated, when either urged without cause, or extended beyond their reach. If therefore at any time it come to pass, that in teaching publicly, or privately in delivering this blessed Sacrament of regeneration, some unsanctified hand, contrary to Christ's supposed ordinance, do intrude itself to execute that whereunto the laws of God and His Church have deputed others; which of these two opinions seemeth more agreeable with equity, ours that disallow what is done amiss, yet make not the force of the word and Sacraments, much less their nature every substance, to depend on the minister's authority and calling; or else theirs, which defeat, disannul, and annihilate both, in respect of that one only personal defect; there being not any law of God which saith, that if the minister be incompetent, *his word shall be no word, his baptism no baptism.*"‡

---

* *Exod, iv.* 24. 2 *Macc. vi.* 10.

† *Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, p.* 863.

‡ *Hooker's Eccl. Polity Book V.* § 62.

The precedents of such extraordinary Baptism are already furnished in the Apostolic times. In the Acts, mention is made of the fact that Philip, a deacon only, baptized the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch. We also read of Paul, afterward the chief of the Apostles, having been baptized by Ananias. The diaconate, as the name imports, was an inferior ministry; not an office with which the cure of souls was originally associated. In its formal institution, there belonged to it no right to baptize, at least nothing of the kind is expressed. It was primarily and mainly concerned with the outward temporal necessities of the poor membership, as appears fully from Acts vii. And yet so far from the validity of Philip's Baptism being questioned, the Apostles St. Peter and St. John, proceeding to Samaria, ratified his act by confirming those whom he had baptized. This view of the diaconate agrees with the actual usage of the Primitive Church; deacons only being allowed to baptize when a bishop or presbyter was not at hand. But in all such cases of necessity the validity of Baptism administered by a deacon was never disputed.

If an ordained minister is absolutely essential, like the proper matter and form, to the valid administration of Baptism, what shall be made of the case of St. Paul? He was baptized, not by the hand of one to whom the original commission was given—Peter, James, or John—but by Ananias. And who was this Ananias? He was not one of the Apostles; he was not even a prominent teacher among the early Christians, and yet not without some reputation, but it was more for earnest piety and devotion.* Receiving Baptism by the hand of Ananias, St.

* The following authorities are given in support of the unofficial character of Ananias. Prof. Lechler says in his commentary *in loco*, "Ananias is not an Apostle, not a distinguished teacher, but a disciple, that is simply a member of the Church, not intrusted either with the ministerial, or any other congregational office." *Lange's Comm., Acts of Apostles.*

"A Jewish disciple at Damascus of high repute, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there (Acts xxii; 12). Tradition makes him to have been *afterwards* bishop of Damascus." *Smith's Bible Dict. Art. Ananias.*

Paul received by Baptism and the laying on of hands the Holy Ghost (Acts ix. 17). The fact of special revelation to Ananias as the administrator of Baptism in St. Paul's case did not remove its *official* irregularity, and yet its validity is unquestionable.

TESTIMONY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

That the Primitive Church allowed the validity of Lay-Baptism, in necessitious cases, may be shown from the action of Councils and the writings of some of the most prominent of the Fathers. If there is weight in great names, it has in its favor a long line of such authorities. Earliest, is Tertullian, A. D. 192 In his treatise De Baptismo, he writes: "The Bishop has the (original) right to give Baptism; next to him Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honor of the Church, by which peace, *i. e.*, order, is preserved. Otherwise the Laity also possess the right; for what is received in common, may be given in common ..... But laymen are in much greater degree obliged by the rules of modesty in the use of their power, since they who are superior to them, are obliged not to assume to themselves the office, which belongs to the Bishop only. Emulation is the mother of strife. All things are lawful, says the holy Apostle, but all things are not expedient. Therefore it ought to suffice them to use this power in necessities, when the condition of the place, or time, or person requires it; for then their charitable assistance is accepted, when the circumstances of one in danger presses them to it. And in this case he would be guilty of a man's destruction who omitted to do, what he lawfully might."* It has been sought

"A Jewish convert living in Damascus, who seems to have had considerable influence among the Christians." *Herzog's Theo. & Eccl. Encyclopedia. Art. Ananias. Trans. by J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D.*

"He was not an Apostle, nor one of the conspicuous members of the Church. And it was not without a deep significance, that he, who was called to be an Apostle, should be baptized by one of whom the Church knows nothing, but that he was a Christian disciple, and had been a devout Jew," *Life & Epistles of St. Paul by Conybeare & Howson; Vol. 1, p. 94.*

* Dandi quidem jus habet summus sacerdos qui est Episcopus; dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est..... Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus ut utaris; sic ubi aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditio compellit; tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis."

to break the force of this testimony of Tertullian in favor of the validity of Lay-Baptism, by regarding it as an expression simply of his *private opinion*, and no authority as to the actual practice of the Church at the time. Kelsall is not far from the mark, in styling this, "a nimble and easy way of taking off an evidence that we do not like." Though extending this right to *laymen*, Tertullian was decidely opposed to its being exercised by women, regarding it as a flagrant act of presumption. But in this there was a manifest inconsistency. Whatever may be said in regard to Tertullian's peculiar notions on some subjects, his testimony on this point carries weight with it as evidence to a practice then already prevailing in the Church.

The Spanish Council at Elvira, A. D. 305, allowed the validity of Baptism administered by laymen who had not disqualified themselves for holy orders. "Peregre navigantes, aut si Ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse *fidelem* (qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec si *bigamus*), baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum Catechumenum." *Concil. Illiberit. can.* xxxviii. This provision was attached to this canon, that in case the persons receiving this necessitous Baptism survived, they were to be brought to the Bishop that it might be recognized and ratified by confirmation. Had this decree of a provincial Synod of the Western Church been contrary to the received principles and usages of the Church, it would certainly have been promptly annulled and repudiated by some subsequent œcumenical Council. No censure having been passed, its decree must be allowed to carry with it full ecclesiastical sanction and force in the case.

Optatus of Milevis, A. D.366. This Father, in speaking of our Lord's commission thus delivers himself: "Non dixit Apostolis, vos facite, alii non faciant. *Quisquis* in nomine Patris, et Filii, et spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, Apostolorum opus implevit."

Jerome, A. D. 384. "Quod, *i. e.*, jus baptizandi, frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita et dare potest." *Dial. adv. Lucifer I. c.* 4.

Augustine 400, A. D. "Quanquam etsi *laicus* aliquis pereunti dederit (Baptisma) necessitate compulsus; quod, cum ipse ac-

ciperet, quomodo dandum esset, addidicit; *nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum.* Nulla enim necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est." . . . . "In necessitate, cum Episcopi, aut Presbyteri, aut quilibet ministrorum non inveniuntur, et urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento hanc vitam finiat, *etiam laicos solere dare Sacramentum*, quod acceperunt, solemus audire." . . . "Sanctum est Baptisma per seipsum, quod datum est in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti: ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam auctoritas traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos; per illos autem ad Episcopos, et alios Sacerdotes, *vel etiam laicos Christianos* ab eadem origine et stirpe venientes."

Here is explicit testimony to the usage of the Church in Augustine's time. The validity of Baptisms administered by laymen is not without the endorsement of this most distinguished Father of the Latin Church. From this time onward, the lay-administration of the Sacrament, in cases of emergency, prevailed universally, both in the Western and the Eastern Church, far beyond the reach of the authority and influence of his name.

THE ROMAN CHURCH.

Ever since the time of Augustine, the Church of Rome, in necessitous cases, has allowed *women* as well as *laymen* to baptize. In a later period this permission was greatly extended, even allowing it to a pagan. The Council of Florence among others put forth this decree. "But in case of necessity, not only a priest, or deacon, but also a layman, or woman, indeed even a pagan and a heretic may baptize, provided only he observes the form of the Church, and intends to do what the Church does." So solicitous was the Roman Church to have this necessitous Baptism properly administered, that several Councils adopted canons requiring the curates to instruct the people in the form of baptizing, lest in their haste and trepidation there might be some damaging omission.* The Roman manuals contain the

---

* *Concil. Ravenn. A. D.* 1311. *Rubr. II. Concil. Ravenn. A. D.* 1314. *R.* 14. *Concil. Arelat. A. D.* 1260. *Concil. Salisb. A. D.* 1420. *de Baptisimo, tom VII.; authorities cited by Kelsall in his answer to Waterland on the validity of Lay-Baptism.*

fullest directions to midwives where the necessity of Baptism appears.

ANGLICAN CHURCH.

The same practice obtained in the Anglican Church from the earliest times. English Councils have passed upon it in the most definite form. "The Pupilla Oculi," which was a standard book of instructions for the clergy in the mediæval period, has some exhaustive statements on the subject, which plainly show that it was the practice of that Church to recognize Baptism as valid, by whomsoever administered, if given with the proper matter and form of words; which practice undoubtedly continued up to the time of the Reformation.* Hooker, undisputed authority in the same Church, says, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity": "Baptism by any man, in case of extreme necessity, *was the voice of the whole world.*" And on the validity of Baptism given by women in case of extremity, he is equally positive, declaring that it ought not to be reiterated. In 1584, a petition, signed by Puritans, was presented to Archbishop Whitgift, asking the inhibition of Baptism by women. The Archbishop replied: "That the Baptism mynistered by women is lawfull and good, howsoever they mynister it, lawfully or unlawfully, (so that the institution of Christ, touching the *words and element*, be dulie used,) no learned man ever doubted, untill now of late, some one or two." In 1661, the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer were altered, so as to make no mention of Baptism by any other than a "lawful minister."† By some this alteration has

* The mediæval rubric of the Salisbury Baptismal Office, A. D. 1085, substantially retained in the Book of Common Prayer, is as follows:—

"The Pastors and Curates shall oft admonish the people that they defer not .....

And they shall warn them that without great cause and neccessity they baptize not children at home in their houses. And when great need shall compel them so to do, that then they minister it on this fashion. First, let them that be present call upon God for His grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer. And then one of them shall name the child and dip him in water, or pour water upon him, saying these words: I BAPTIZE THEE IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST, AMEN. *And let them not doubt but that the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized.*

† The old rubric was: Non licet laico vel mulieri aliquem baptizare, nisi in articulo necessitatis. Si vero vir et mulier adessent ubi immineret necessitatis articulus baptizandi puerum, et non esset alius minister ad hoc magis idoneus præsens, vir baptizet et non mulier, nisi forte mulier bene sciret verba sacramentalia et non vir, vel aliud impedimentum subesset.—*Sarum Manual.*

been regarded as a formal decision of the Anglican Church against the validity of Lay-Baptism; others, and among these stand some of the most eminent Episcopal divines both of this country and England, say, that while this alteration does, and was intended to check the practice of Lay-Baptism, it was no decision against its validity, and the practice of the Church for unbroken centuries.* At all events the practice of the Episcopal Church in both countries is still in favor of its validity. Contending that ordination episcopally conveyed is alone true and lawful, they reduce the ministrations of the Clergyman of dissenting Churches to the level of lay-ministrations, and yet do not hesitate to receive members from those Churches without subjecting them to the necessity of re-baptism, thus recognizing their unepiscopal, and, therefore, irregular Baptism as true and valid.

---

* Blunt, in his *"Annotated Book of Common Prayer"*, p. 213, says in a note touching the alteration of the rubric, limiting the administration of Baptism to lawful ministers, that it affected not the Church's position on the subject of necessitous Baptism, inasmuch as "Minister," in the Book of Common Prayer, means "executor officii," and if used in that sense, the addition of "lawful" does not by any means of necessity restrict it to a clergyman. The *"alius minister ad hoc magis idoneus"* of the former rubric, shows that the word minister was used even of lay persons in the case of the administration of Baptism, long before the Reformation. Nor did this action throw any doubt upon the validity of the Baptism of the 300,000 persons in England who had been baptized by laymen, as no public provision was made for their re-baptism.

"The phrase 'any other lawful minister,' added, in 1661, at Bishop Cosin's suggestion, is, in fact, the equivalent of an ancient Latin rubric (the one above quoted), referring to lay persons baptizing, and the word minister is used to indicate the person ministering the Sacrament, without reference to his being a clergyman." *Sacraments and Sacramental ordinances, by Rev John Henry Blunt*, p. 63.

Rev. Dr. Lee says, "The term 'lawful minister' with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism includes under certain circumstances not only persons clerical but lay. But even if it meant an 'ordained' minister only, it would simply act as a discouragement to lay and schismatical Baptism, for which purpose it was introduced in the Book of 1604, as treating them *irregular* but *valid*, and therefore not to be reiterated conditionally or otherwise, for the proper matter and form are alone essential to this Sacrament, 'a lawful (ordained) minister' is not." *Directorium Anglicanum, Third Ed. London, p.* 199.

"If a Priest or Deacon may not be had, in an urgent case of private Baptism (the speedy death of the child being apprehended), the parents had better get some male friend to baptize the child. If such cannot be procured, the father must administer the Sacrament; the mother may only do so if the father knows not the Sacramental words, or some other impediment." *Ib. p.* 203.

LUTHERAN CHURCH.

No change in this particular was proposed by the Lutheran Reformers. Sacramental and historical theology was not repudiated by them in the correction of the overlaid abuses of the Papacy. Occupying high ground in reference to the necessity and efficacy of the Sacraments, the Lutheran theologians had no difficulty in accepting the validity of Lay-Baptism in extreme cases, and continuing in the new order of things, under proper ecclesiastical regulations, the practice of the primitive, mediæval, and Roman Church. It would burden this article too much to make extensive quotations from the old Lutheran divines and the early liturgies of that Church. Suffice it to say, that in both ways its undeviating testimony is given to the validity of necessitous Baptism by laymen. Take the following unquestionable authorities, only as examples among many others at hand.

Buddeus says: "They who by divine command can confer Baptism are the rightly constituted ministers of the Church. If, however, no minister of the Church be present, and the danger of death forbid the deferring of Baptism, the judgment of our Church is that it may be rightly administered by a layman or a woman."* Hollazius says: "Extraordinarily however, and in case of necessity, any pious Christian, male or female, acquainted with the Sacraments can administer Baptism."†

In Lutheran Liturgies explicit directions are given for the proper administration of what is styled "Noth-Taufe." From such an old service book, bearing date A. D. 1713, but the reprint, as shown by the illuminated title-page of an older liturgy published A. D. 1626, under the auspices of John Casimir, Duke of Saxony, we take the following rubric: "Es sollen

---

* "Qui baptismum ex Numinis mandato, aliis rite conferre possunt, ministrii ecclesiæ sunt rite constituti. Quodsi ecclesiæ minister non adsit, vitæque periculum differe diutius aptismum vetet, eundem a laico etiam, ant femina, recte administrari, ecclesiæ nostræ est sententia." *Inst. Theo. Dog., Lib. V., cap. I., § 4.*

† "Extraordinarie vero, et in casu necessitatis, quivis Christianus pius et rituum sacrorum gnarus, sive sit mas, sive fœmina, baptismum administratri potest."

aber die Pfarrer das Volck in den Predigten unterrichten, dass sie nicht leitlich zu der Noth Tauff eilen sollen, wann es aber die höchste Nothdurfft erfordert, dass man tauffen soll und muss, dass die, so dabey seynd, unsern Herrn Gott zuvor aufruffen, und ein Vater Unser beten, wann solches geschehen, als dann darauf taufen, in Namen des Vaters, und des Sohns, und des Heiligen Geistes, und dass man dann nicht zweifele, das Kind sey recht und gnugsam getaufft, und nicht soll anderweit in der Kirchen, oder sonst öffentlich getaufft werden. Doch soll man solch Kind, wenn es am Leben bleibet in die Kirchen tragen, das der Pfarrer die Leute frage, ob sie auch gewiss seyen dass das Kind recht getaufft sey, und mit was Weise und Worten sie es getaufft haben," &c. Women were not allowed to baptize only under circumstances of the greatest need, and only then in the failure to get some Christian man there, and then it is added: "Aber so dasselbige wegen Schwachheit des Kindes nicht seyn mochte, als den soll die Wehe-Mutter, oder welches gegenwärtig Christlich-Weib sich des Tauffens unterfangen will, zwo oder drey Personen, so vorhanden, zum Zeugniss beruffen und erfordern, damit auf zweyer oder dreyer Kundschafft, die heilege Tauffe des Kindes bestehe, und zuvor das Gebet Christi, Vater Unser, &c., beten, dem Kind ein Namen geben, und darauf das Kind tauffen und sprechen: Ich tauffe dich in Namen Gottes des Vaters, und des Sohns, und des Heiligen Geistes."

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

No definite canon has been adopted by the Reformed Church on the subject; and the absence from its liturgies of all directions and forms for the right administration of "Noth-Taufe," such as the above, would indicate an unfavorable judgment as to its validity even in necessitous cases. With the exception of Zwingle, it must be conceded, the most prominent Reformed divines were decidedly opposed to the practice, although frankly confessing that it had in its favor the authority of antiquity.

Zwingle says: "Wir sind getouft, und sind recht getouft;

denn es kann ein jedes wyb sebs toufen."* "Daran dry irrungen des umstands warend (das ist, der elementen diser welt). . . . . An dem umstand der person ward geirret, dass alein der Pfaff söllte toufen; so man doch wol wusst, das ein jedlich mensch toufen mocht, ouch die hebamm und vorgängerinn."†

Calvin, in his Institutes, Book IV., Chap. XV., thus expresses his dissent: "The custom, which has been received and practised for many ages, and almost from the primitive times of the Church, for Baptism to be performed by laymen, in cases where death is apprehended, and no minister was present in time, it appears to me impossible to defend by any good reason."‡ Over against the usuage of the Church for unbroken centuries, Calvin interposes here simply his *private judgment.* Rather than that infants should die without Baptism, Luther and his followers, we have seen, in accordance with the ancient and uniform practice of the Church, allowed a layman or woman to administer it in times of necessity. But Calvin put the doctrine of Baptism a pitch lower. He allowed its necessity, but only as *necessitate præcepti*, by God's command, and so far *necessitate medii*, as it is God's ordinary means of regeneration and giving salvation; denying that there is or can be any such direct necessity as to justify its lay-administration. And yet even this Reformer did not insist absolutely *on the rebaptization of all* that had been baptized by lay-hands, thus practically at least recognizing its validity. In one of his letters, while condemning absolutely all Baptisms administered by women, he yet cautions against the scandal of repeating that administered by *laymen*, since its reputed validity has the *countenance of antiquity*, and its repetition, he thought, would be regarded as an innovation.§

Ursinus is clearly against the administration of this Sacrament by lay-hands. In his exposition of Question 71, Heidel-

---

* *Huldrici Zwinglii Opera. Vol. II., p.* 278. *Zurich,* 1830. † *Ib. p.* 299.

‡ "Multis abhinc seculis adeoque ab ipso fere ecclesiæ exordio receptum fuisse, ut in periculo mortis laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firma ratione defendi queat."

§ *Kellsall's Reply to Waterland. Waterland's Works, Vol. VI., p* 95.

berg Catechism, he says: "Baptism is properly used when it is administered by the ministers to whom Christ has limited it, and whom He has sent to teach and baptize, and not by women and others whom God has not sent."* "Since the administration of the Sacraments forms a part of the ecclesiastical ministry, those who are not called to this, and *especially women*, ought not to take upon themselves the right and authority to baptize."† The emphatic exception made here in the case of *women* would seem to indicate, even in the judgment of Ursinus, that the administration of this Sacrament by *laymen*, under urgent circumstances, might be admissible. At all events, in his defence of Infant Baptism, he quotes, with evident approbation, this saying of Augustine: "*The whole Church holds the doctrine of Infant Baptism by tradition. What the whole Church holds and has always retained, although it has not been decreed by any Council, that it is just and proper for us to believe, as if it had been delivered and handed down by apostolic authority.*"‡ From the time of Tertullian, at least, the custom of the lay-administration of Baptism, in necessitous cases, as has already been shown, has been held and always retained in the Church, thus carrying along with it the very authority —*tradition*—which Ursinus claims in support of Infant Baptism. If the voice of the Church is to be respected in the one instance, it is certainly entitled to a like respect in the other.

Beza, writing to Bullinger from Geneva, about the usages obtaining in the Anglican Church, most decidedly disapproves of Lay-Baptism in these words: "What must we say when, in

---

* *Ursinus' Comm. on Heidelberg Catechism; translated by Rev. Dr. Williard, p.* 363. "Baptismus administretur ab iis, quibus id Christus, præcepit, *hoc est*, ministris ecclesiæ, quos Christus misit ad docendum et baptizandum: non a mulieribus, aut aliis, qui a Deo non sunt missi, et nomine Dei nihil stipulari possunt." *Corpus Doctrinæ Christianæ; Hanover edition*, 1634, *p.* 391.

† *Dr. Williard's Translation of Ursinus' Comm. p.* 373. These "Theses concerning Baptism," concluding Ursinus' exposition of this Sacrament, have been omitted in the Hanover edition, now before us.

‡ "*Baptismum parvulorum traditum tenet universitas Ecclesiæ. Quod universa tenet Ecclesiæ, nec a Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est: non nisi apostolica authoritatate traditum rectissime credimus.*"

case of necessity, as they call it, women are allowed to baptize."*

It is not to be disputed that the Reformed divines generally were opposed to the practice of the lay-administration of Baptism, and more especially by women, even under the most urgent circumstances. Assuming this position, whether true or false, they broke with the entire pre-Reformation Church, and also, in this particular, the more historical and sacramental branch of the Reformation itself, as represented by the Lutheran and Anglican communions, which already has been amply shown. The whole current of church practice and authority was against them in this particular.

Baptism administered by women, as has already been noticed, was singled out by Ursinus as especially irregular and objectionable. The validity of Baptism by women must follow the recognition of that administered by *laymen*. The one follows the other logically and necessarily. Maskell says: "Necessity has always been regarded by the Church, as a fit reason why men, neither priests nor deacons, should baptize: and if the same necessity exists, where no man happens to be at hand, what is there in the nature of the thing, which should prevent the administration of this Sacrament by a woman? Doubtless it must be ventured upon, only in the last extremity, only when life appears to be fast ebbing away, and no hope left."†

The irregularity of Lay-Baptism has been strongly urged against its integrity. An act, irregular in some of its particulars, may nevertheless be valid. Exigencies making it imperative, its integrity and binding force are in no way affected by such irregularity. During the recent civil war, the exigencies of the case demanding it, the President of the United States suspended the writ of Habeas Corpus. The act was *irregular*—an extraordinary stretch of authority. But the Congress, at the session ensuing, conceding the extraordinary and necessitous circumstances under which the President was called to act, recognized its validity and confirmed the course adopted.

---

* *Zurich Letters, p.* 274. *Parker Society, Cambridge,* 1846.

† *Holy Baptism, by Rev. W. Maskell, M.A., p.* 263.

The subsequent public and official recognition of such necessitous Baptism, in case the persons thus baptized lived, was deemed the necessary complement and seal of its former lay-administration. And in the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Anglican Churches, a special form is provided for the public ratification of all such irregular Baptisms.*

Baptism looks forward to its personal and voluntary ratification in Confirmation. It only reaches in this supplementary rite its last sense and meaning. The apostolic name of this rite, admitting the catechumen into full membership with the Church, was "the laying on of hands;"† in the sub-apostolic age, it was known as "the sealing," or "the anointing." It was conceded by the ancient Church, that all the defects of an irregularly administered Baptism were covered by this supplemental act. Hence, in the primitive ages, Baptism was immediately followed by confirmation; this was the practice, whether the person baptized was an adult, a youth, or an infant.‡

From the authorities presented, and the stream is singularly constant and strong in one direction, Baptism, we have learned, was accounted valid when administered, *first*, with water, *secondly*, with the prescribed form, and *thirdly*, both regular and valid, when in addition to these absolute requisites, administered by an ordained minister. And the voice of the Church, as it comes down through the ages, bears, with wonderful unanimity, unmistakable testimony to the validity of the lay-administration of Baptism in extreme cases; that is, it was recognized, and no repetition necessary, provided that it had been given with the proper matter and the proper form.

---

* The Palatinate Liturgy affirms that no unordained man ought to assume the office of Baptism, without however expressing any opinion on the validity of its lay-administration in exceptional cases.

† Acts viii. 12–17, xix. 5, 6; Heb. vi. 2.

‡ *Sacraments and Sacramental Ordinances, by Rev. John Henry Blunt, p.* 96.

ART. III.—ANSWER TO PROFESSOR DORNER.

BY JOHN W. NEVIN, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

The following theological discussion appeared originally as a series of communications in the *Reformed Church Messenger*. This form of publication was adopted, for the purpose of bringing the subject immediately and widely to popular attention. A desire, however, has been expressed from different quarters to have it brought into more consolidated and permanent form in the *Mercersburg Review;* to whose pages accordingly it is now transferred, with very little alteration or change. It has been thought best to give all at once as a single long article in the present number of the *Review*.

INTRODUCTION.

An interesting and able article on the Liturgical Controversy of the German Reformed Church in the United States, appears in a late number of the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, from the pen of the celebrated Dr. Dorner of Berlin.

We have reason to feel ourselves complimented, as a Church, by such notice directed towards us from so high a quarter. It is the first time that the course of theology in this country has drawn upon itself to any such extent, the observation and criticism of a leading German Review. The theological scholarship of Germany has been very much in the habit of slighting the movement of religious thought both in England and in the United States, as hardly deserving to be considered scientific at all in any true sense of the term. Dr. Dorner himself, in his History of Protestant Theology, finds but little to say on the subject; two or three pages at the close of the work being all he considers necessary to devote, in particular, to this country. "In North America," he tells us, "there is hardly as yet, so

far as we are able to see, any connected literary history." He expresses the hope, however, that a better era for scientific theology is before us; and ends his book finally with these significant words:

"America is still in the commencement only of its theological life; but the future of Protestantism depends, in a large measure, on the future development of this vigorous people, now emancipated also from the curse of slavery; making it thus of incalculable importance, that the intercourse which has been opened there with German Protestantism and its results, should be maintained and enlarged. At present divisions abound, and the opposition of parties is too much a matter of wilfulness and mere outward interest to lead to any earnest scientific conflict. But in proportion as the sense for science increases, and along with this the power of thought, which tends always to union by being directed toward the general and the absolutely true, the more must many of the denominations now existing in the country pass away of themselves; whilst others will enter upon a course of mutual understanding that may be expected to secure for their spiritual and religious life a common history which, with that of Great Britain, will rival in full finally the fruitfulness of German science."

It is complimentary, I repeat, then, in such view of the case, that the consideration of Germany is now directed toward the theological discussions of our American Reformed Church, in the way we find it to be in this extended and respectful criticism coming from so great a man.

It is a matter for congratulation, moreover, that these discussions themselves are in this way gaining broader and more earnest attention. The subjects with which they are employed deserve it. There have been those among us, we know, who have not been disposed to regard them in such light. But in truth, there are no more practically important questions before the Christian world, at this time, than just these theological debates with which our Church is now so earnestly engaged. They have to do with the most central and profound interests of Christianity. It may possibly help to open the eyes of some to their

significance, that they are made, in the case before us, the object of so learned a review in the Berlin *Jahrbücher*. Dorner's article shows, that they are not mere word fights, or controversies about things of little or no account.

Let us trust also, that it may help to lift the general discussion above the level of mere party prejudice and strife, and to give it such a character of decency and fair conduct, as all may see to be suitable to its great importance. Very much of the opposition which has been made in this country thus far to what is called, for distinction's sake, the Mercersburg theology, has been in a form the very reverse of all this. It has taken no pains to understand what it has set itself to condemn. Its only force has been in garbled misrepresentation, special pleadings, *ad captandum* appeals to popular prejudice and abusive scurrilities of the lowest and poorest sort. I have myself been pelted of late with any amount of this polemical mud. It admits, of course, of no notice or reply. Men must learn to be decent before they can be reasoned with as rational or moral. In such circumstances, however, it is especially refreshing to fall in with such an altogether different style of controversy, as we have offered to us in this transatlantic article of Professor Dorner. It is serious, dignified, calm, gentlemanly and Christian. Why is it, that the qualities of controversial truth and fairness are so much harder to be maintained in this country, than seems to be the case in Europe? We know how it is with our common political press, as contrasted with that of England. Is it any better, in the end, with our religious press?

Let Dorner's article serve as an example, and as a rebuke, for this wretched style of controversy. It is worthy of being widely known and read for this purpose only, if for no other. I am not sorry to hear, therefore, that it is in the way of being published for general circulation among us, both in German and English. It may do good; and I have no apprehension, at all events, of its doing any harm.*

* The article has since made its appearance in an English translation. It is hard to say, however, whether this should be considered now a subject for congratulation or otherwise; so little justice does the translation do to the original. Dr. Dorner's

But, in the nature of the case, the article calls for respectful notice and reply. I have no right to pass it by as unworthy of attention, as I might treat the railing of a Thersites or the gasconade of a theological sciolist. Dr. Dorner himself modestly offers his criticism as a contribution simply to the general theological discussion in which we are involved; not for the purpose of crushing it and putting an end to it, by any means; but with the view only of promoting and assisting it in its own proper course. *He*, at least does not seek to lord it over our American freedom and faith, whatever others may be trying to do in his name. To him, therefore, no less than to the solemn interest of the subject itself, I owe the duty of considering and answering what he has seen proper to offer for our consideration, as well as for the consideration of the world at large, in this public challenge and review.

This I propose to do through the columns of the *Messenger*. On some account it might seem better to do it in the form of an article for the *Mercersburg Review*. But the *Messenger* has a much wider circulation; and, besides, I wish to bring the points here at issue directly before the people. They are not theological niceties simply, in which ministers only may be expected to take an interest. They are of general practical concern. I believe, that our people generally can understand them; and the more they can be brought to look at them, and to see what they really mean, the less fear I have of their being turned away from the old and right faith of the CREED in regard to them, by any wrong teaching brought to bear upon the case, whether from this side of the Atlantic or from the other side.

All I care to say farther in this introductory article is to call attention briefly to two or three general preliminary considerations, the force of which must be felt at once by all candid and liberal minds.

---

style is none of the best in German; but this version of it into English makes it fairly barbarous. The *Uebersetzung* is at once an oversetting and an upsetting; in view of which, Dorner (with his knowledge of English) may well join tears with *Herzog*, and cry: Save me too from my American friends! As it is, few will have patience to read the pamphlet, and fewer still will have power to understand it.

I. Dr. Dorner, it must be remembered, does not belong to the German Reformed Church. Originally of the Lutheran Confession, he stands now in the bosom of the United, so-called, Evangelical Church of Prussia. In this United Church he is still confessionally Lutheran, so far as historical Protestant descent is concerned. But his theory of Protestantism is based on the assumption, that the old orthodoxy of the two Confessions (Lutheran and Reformed) has come to a sort of general collapse through the triumph of Rationalism on both sides, making it necessary to reconstruct the whole system in a new form. This I mention, not to disparage at all his character as a theologian, but to show the absurdity of making him an ultimate umpire in our German *Reformed* theological controversies and discussions. It is, indeed, somewhat laughable to find those among us, who at other times affect to be so jealous of outside opinions and views (as held, for example, by Catholics, Anglicans, or Lutherans), now all at once ready to throw themselves into the arms of Dr. Dorner, as though "a Daniel had come to judgement," just because at some points he happens to declare himself in a measure favorable to their laboring cause. They might just as well, of course, call in the judgment of respectable outsiders at home.

And in fact, as we know, they are quite ready also to do this very thing, whenever they have a chance to lug in such foreign help; seeming to feel, apparently, that however harsh the voice of strangers may sound when it is against them, it is all sweet enough where it pipes in their favor. Thus it is, that the authority of outside denominations is invoked, in all manner of ways, to overwhelm with a sort of brute force the free progress of Christian thought and life among ourselves. We must not be allowed to take our own course as an American German Reformed Church, because forsooth it does not suit the ecclesiastical fancy of Presbyterians, Methodists, or Episcopalians. Our home theology must bend in servile obeisance to the oracular censure simply of some good outsider, like Dr. Hodge or Bishop McIlvaine; or worse still, must trail its colors in the dust, before the bushwhacking shots and thrusts of some foreign religious

sheet like the *New York Observer*, the *Lutheran Observer*, the *Christian Intelligencer*,the *Presbyterian*, or the *Independent*.

But all this is asking too much. To say nothing of the bushwhacking newspapers, we cannot allow even such learned and excellent men as those just named, to do our thinking, and fix up our orthodoxy, in this extra-curial style. We deny their lawful jurisdiction in the premises. We respect them, and are glad to take counsel with them on matters pertaining to our common faith; but we cannot consent to be ruled conclusively in our denominational views by Dr. McIlvaine or Dr. Hodge, the one an Episcopalian, and the other a Presbyterian, in this country; and it is hard to see, therefore, why we should yield any more passively in the matter to the quoted judgment of the Lutheran Unionist, Dr. Dorner, in Germany.

II. The mere fact, let it be noted in the next place, that Dr. Dorner is a great *German* theologian, forms no reason whatever for succumbing to his judgment in any such slavish way. With our opponents themselves, heretofore, it has been rather the fashion to depreciate the speculations of the later German theology, and to charge it upon us as a fault that we were following it, as an *ignis fatuus*, into the swamps of transcendentalism and perilous neology. They had all zeal professedly for Ursinus, Olevianus, Pareus, and other such respectable monuments of the buried past; but they were not disposed to listen at all to the profound historical and exegetical views of such men as Tholuck, or Julius Müller, or Liebner, or Martensen, the representatives of the waking, living present. Now, however, a sudden change has come over the spirit of their dream. Dorner has spoken in their favor; has done so at least to a certain extent; and now; Huzza for Germany! Great is the Modern Theology of Germany!

But this sudden rapture is not simply inconsistent; it is ludicrously absurd. It goes on the assumption, that German theology is united and settled in its present form; that it represents fairly the Protestant faith of the sixteenth century; and that Dr. Dorner is a fair and full exponent of this united historical faith, for the Reformed Church as well as for the Luther-

an, and for the Reformed Church, not only in Germany, but all over the Christian world. But the assumption is preposterous in all its parts.

The modern theology of Germany, even in its best character, is anything but united or harmonious in any such results as it has yet reached. It is, as Dorner himself shows in his History of Protestantism, in a vast transition state, which is still terribly confused and chaotic. He asks us to have faith in it as a new creation, emerging from the wreck and chaos of Rationalism. We may try to do so; we may hail what seems to be the weeping rainbow of hope, spanning its still stormful horizon with the promise of better things to come. But it is going altogether too far, when we are required to accept the *unfinished* processes of German thought, at such a time, for fixed and finally settled conclusions. Of course, then again, we cannot agree to take any such unfiinshed thinking as being in and of itself equivalent at once to the orthodox thinking of the 16th, and 17th centuries. Dorner, and all other German theologians, plant themselves now on the idea of a historical movement in Protestant theology, which puts the notion of any mere outward and mechanical repristination of this sort wholly out of the question. Then as for the right of Dorner himself to be considered in any way the central representative organ of this embryonic new creation, thus struggling to come to the full birth of a regenerated German Protestantism, it is enough to say, that he is too modest and too wise a man to claim it, and that if he did do so, the claim would be resisted on all sides. He is only one strong German voice, among many other German voices, heroically exercised in the defence of what is held to be Christian truth. But these voices are still wonderfully divided among themselves. Dorner, on important points, differs from other German divines, no less orthodox and evangelical, to say the least, than himself. And what is especially to the point, the orthodoxy of all of them together would be considered more or less scandalous, on certain topics, if an attempt were made to introduce it, among the so-called evangelical denominations of this country.

III. Another general remark, to be steadily kept in mind. The *stand-point* of Dr. Dorner's observation and criticism detracts largely from its value. He is too far away from what he undertakes to censure, to perform the office with full intelligence. He is so geographically. He looks at us through a telescope, across the broad Atlantic; and unfortunately one chief lens of his instrument is very far from being pellucid and clear. So he sees us only with dim vision, as "men like trees walking." His article is at fault seriously, where it touches on points of fact in the history of our late Liturgical movement; and it betrays altogether a very confused apprehension of our American church life generally, as well as of the ecclesiastical relations in particular of our American German Reformed Church. But Dr. Dorner's distance from us is not simply geographical; it is at the same time political also and moral; and this makes it above all hard for him, as a German theologian, to understand the freedom of our institutions, or to do justice to the true idea of the Christian Church, as it falls in naturally and easily with the presence of such freedom. The government of the Church in Germany is Erastian, or as they sometimes call it, *Cæsareo-papistic;* the king, pope or head; the Church, in truth, simply a branch or department of the State, having the administration of its affairs in the hands of a civil bureau. It is easy to see and feel, how little at home Dr. Dorner is, under these circumstances, in our system of Classes and Synods, in our ideas of church authority, and so in the course of our ecclesiastical affairs generally. It is all to him more or less *terra incognita*, He is among us somewhat like those brethren, of whom St. Paul speaks in the Epistle to the Galatians, "who came in privily," he says, "to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus;" to whom, however, he immediately adds, "we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour." Dr. Dorner, of course, is not to be classed with these Jewish intermeddlers. On the contrary, we welcome his fraternal interest, foreign German and Lutheran though he be, in our Reformed Church affairs. But we must not be expected to give place to his false ecclesiastical

standpoint, when we know our own to be altogether more true to the original idea of Christianity and to the Apostles' Creed.

On this subject I may be allowed to quote, in conclusion, what I wrote nearly a year ago in an article for the *Mercersburg Review:*

"Theory and speculation have been with us subordinate always to the idea of positive Christianity, as an object of faith exhibited to us in the Bible and the history of the actual Church. The Christological principle has been for us immeasurably more than the requirements of any school of philosophy; its practical consequences have weighed more with us than the logical necessities of any metaphysical system. We have been able to see and own thankfully the service which has been rendered to the cause of Christianity, through the intonation of this great principle, by Schleiermacher, and other master minds, who have here followed him with far more orthodoxy than he ever had himself, without feeling ourselves bound in the least to accept in full all that any such master mind may have been led to deduce from the principle as belonging to the right construction of Christian doctrine. Our theology, in this view, has not been built upon Schleiermacher, or Ullmann, or Dorner, however much of obligation it cheerfully owes to each of them, as well as to others, whose more or less variant systems of thought go together to make up the conception of what is called the evangelical theology of Germany in its most modern form. Whatever of force and worth these Christological studies carry with them for our thinking, all is felt to rest ultimately only in their bearing on the actual life of Christ, and the relation they hold to the development of the mystery of godliness in the actual history of the Church. Here we reach what we feel to be surer and more solid ground than any such studies of themselves furnish; and just because these studies seem too often to stop short of what is involved for faith in the full historical apprehension of the Christian mystery, as a continuous presence in the world, they are found to be at certain points more or less unsatisfactory, in the end, to our religious feeling. Here it is that, with all our respect for German divinity, we consciously come to a break with it in our thoughts, and feel the necessity of supple-

menting it with the more practical way of looking at Christianity which we find embodied in the ancient Creeds. *In this respect*, we freely admit, our theology is more Anglican than German. We stand upon the old Creeds. We believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

There it is once more, in black and white, without the fear of Professor J. H. Good or Mr. A. S. Vaughan before our eyes. *Anglican*, we say, or English, more than German, IN THIS RESPECT, though not in other respects. If these gentlemen now choose to go off again in mock heroics on the matter, let them do so to their heart's content. Only let them not be guilty again of *falsifying*, as before, by any garbled quotation, the plain sense of such very plain words.

II. CONFUSION AS TO FACTS.

Dr. Dorner tells us, that he has been earnestly solicited by members of the Reformed Church in this country, to declare himself in regard to our controversies;* in view more particularly of the fact, that some reference was made at Dayton, to his great Christological work, as well as to the later German theology generally, in support of the Christological tendency now prevailing among us. What the point is precisely, on which he feels himself to have been misrepresented in the case, he does not say; and one can hardly help feeling, that his sensitiveness has made much more of it than was necessary. I do not remember, in what way his name was quoted at Dayton; but I know it could not have been in favor of any specific view of Christ's person; because I have never pretended to know fully the last result of Dr. Dorner's historico-theological speculations on this subject. All that could have been meant by the appeal

* On this point the Professor refers in a note to the famous judgment which was surreptitiously obtained from him, through a couple of American students, for the use of Dr. Bomberger's pamphlet *Reformed, not Ritualistic*, last year. In the way of apology he says, "the conversation became public without *their* or my knowledge and will." No doubt this is true, so far as Dorner himself is concerned; but it is no justification of his want of prudence, in allowing himself to be taken advantage of in so gross a manner. He must be considered as in some measure responsible, in the circumstances, for the otherwise irresponsible use which has been made of his great name.

in question was, that the later evangelical theology of Germany in general, as represented by such men as Dorner, Ullmann, and others, has come to be ruled characteristically by the Christological idea, the central significance of the person of Christ, as we have it insisted upon with so much genial force by the illustrious Schleiermacher. This general fact has nothing to do with the particular theological system of Dr. Dorner, or with that of any other German scholar, in its details, He has no right to assume or require, that our Christological thinking must agree at all points with *his* Christological thinking, to be at all entitled to a place in this general order of thought. It has now become evident enough, that Dorner disowns certain views, which our American Reformed theology has come largely to embrace, as necessary deductions from the mystery of the Incarnation. In this, however, we simply hold him to be wrong; which is no reason at all, of course, for giving up our claim of being in reigning affinity with him, nevertheless, as well as with the better theology of Germany at large, in what may be called its predominant Christological character at the present time. In this respect, the statement made in 1866, at Dayton, remains still in full force. It is just as true now, as it was then.

Indeed Dr. Dorner himself admits as much, when he says at the close of his review: "In conclusion, I hail with joy the manifold affinity of this transatlantic theology with thoughts, which lie at the ground of our later German science, and find it represented with fire and force. But it stands in danger also, if I am not mistaken, of wasting its energies in abnormal productions and repristinations. May what we have here written contribute something toward such a revision of doctrinal principles, as may serve to promote both the peace of the Church and the progress of science." This is well. It acknowledges enough. Full agreement with any particular scheme of German theology has not been pretended, and is not desired. Criticism from such quarter, as we have it in the case before us, is honored and welcomed; but it is not for that reason to be accepted blindly. It is only necessary, that it should be carefully weighed in the balance and taken at its actual worth.

Dr. Dorner opens his review with a historical sketch of some ten pages, intended to set forth in brief the progress of the Liturgical movement in our American Reformed Church. In this he tries to be calm and fair; but any one acquainted with the actual course of things among us, can easily see, that he has a very dim and shadowy apprehension of our affairs, as well as of the ecclesiastical relations of this country generally; and that he is guilty, therefore, of gross injustice in what he allows himself to say on this part of his subject. It is rather a humiliating commentary, indeed, in the case of so great a historian, on the reliableness of historical judgments and pictures generally, as concerned with life belonging to other countries and times. If Dorner's characteristics of Christian antiquity, or his sketches of the past three centuries of European Protestantism, are to be estimated at all by his success in reporting the brief chapter he here gives us on the Liturgical movement of our German Reformed Church, it must detract seriously, we think, from our confidence both in his *Christological History* and in his recent *History of Protestant Theology*. How much of all history, alas, is but a caricature in this way, more or less, of what it gravely sets forth as true! To the general difficulty of looking across the Atlantic with the eyes of a foreigner, there is added in the case of our Berlin Professor, I am sorry to say, a very palpable prejudice in favor of the faction, which has obtained his ear, and solicited his interference, in this controversy; a prejudice which has made it impossible for him to do any proper justice to statements from the other side. He sees things through the spectacles forced upon him from this officious quarter; and so, of course, sees them all awry.

Take as an example the way in which he refers to the action of the Synod at Easton, in 1861, He will have it, that this was designed to operate as a bar to the tendency that resulted finally in the Revised Liturgy as it now stands. But for those, who were at the Synod, and who know the source and the animus of that action, any such hypothesis is simply absurd. My own course at this Synod, while he pronounces it "such as became a manly Christian character," he, at the same time, grossly mis-

represents, so as to make it in fact just the reverse. We know, on whose authority these perversions of history are made. They are not designed and willful with Dr. Dorner. But it is still a reproach to him, that he could allow himself to be imposed upon by such transparent falsification. It is not necessary, however, to go here into any more particular notation of his blunders. The points to which they refer are already sufficiently settled, by home knowledge, for all who have taken any active interest in the subject among ourselves; while Dr. Dorner and his readers in Germany, are too far away, both in body and spirit, to make it worth while at all to aim at disabusing them of their wrong impressions. It adds nothing to Dr. Bomberger's special pleading, that it happens in this case to be echoed back upon us by Dr. Dorner. Let it pass for what it is worth.

One striking general instance of this *ex parte* construction of history, we have in the way our transatlantic reviewer tries to cover up Dr. Bomberger's huge inconsistency, in first approving and afterwards denouncing the work he had himself assisted in bringing to pass through the labors of the Liturgical Committee. He has to admit that Dr. Bomberger was well satisfied with the *Provisional Liturgy* in 1857, and that he even went so far as to praise it publicly in very strong terms. But he seeks to break the force of this admission again, by telling us, that there were in that Liturgy two different schemes of worship in fact, joined together in a merely outward way; meaning by this to convey the impression, that Dr. Bomberger approved simply what belonged to one of these schemes, without caring to express at the time his dissatisfaction with the other.

Referring then to me, he will have it that I was bent all along on bringing the mind of the Church to a different system in conformity with my own ideas of Christian worship. The object thus of my report on the Liturgical Question, submitted to the Synod at Chambersburg in 1862, instead of being an honest effort to come to a fair and full understanding of what the Synod really wished in regard to a Liturgy, was no better than a bold attempt to bring that body to a sort of forced compliance with

my views. He even quotes me as acknowledging, that the Synod at Easton had desired only a modification of the Provisional Liturgy in a direction opposed to Ritualism; and argues, therefore, that what I wanted was a fundamental change in the book; overlooking altogether the very plain fact, that the tract in question makes the Provisional Liturgy itself, as it then stood, to be an example throughout of that very altar service, which it sought to distinguish with so much pains from a mere pulpit service, in order to know whether or not the Synod wished to abide by its reigning character now, or to fall over to the other scheme.

Take, in proof of this, a single passage from the tract (p. 39), at the close of its contrast between the two kinds of worship: "If it be asked now, on which of these two liturgical schemes the *Provisional Liturgy* of the German Reformed Church has been constructed, the answer must be, of course, that it was intended to be prevailingly a liturgy for the altar and not simply a pulpit liturgy. It aims at being churchly, sacramental, and in proper measure also priestly. It is formed to move round the sun of righteousness in the heavenly orbit of the Church year. It seeks to make the people outwardly active along with the minister, in the outward solemnities of public worship. In all this, it falls in with what may be considered the reigning genius of such worship in the first ages of the Church; and in doing so, has incorporated into itself largely, of course, those primitive forms, which have been considered classical and sacred for all liturgical use from the beginning. This much is patent at once on the face of the new Liturgy; and it has never pretended to appear in any other character."

This is plain; but now, in the face of this, Dr. Dorner argues, that my object in the tract was to discourage the idea of a simple modification of the Provisional Liturgy as ordered at Easton, and to engage the mind of the Synod in favor of another scheme altogether; which then the Synod, after all, still refused formally to sanction; while the Committee, however, went on afterwards to carry it out nevertheless in its own way, as we have it at last before the world in the form of the

Revised Liturgy. This, it is quietly assumed, amounted to such a radical variation from the Provisional Liturgy, as to account satisfactorily for Dr. Bomberger's wonderful metempsychosis in regard to the whole movement. But all that Dr. Dorner thus assumes would seem to rest entirely on Dr. Bomberger's own "History and Criticism of the Ritualistic Movement in the German Reformed Church." There is no evidence at all, that he has ever himself seen the Provisional Liturgy. He talks in the dark, therefore, when he speaks of it as essentially different in any way from the Revised Liturgy. The very features and forms that Dr. Bomberger now abominates, as full of all mischief, are actually in the Provisional Liturgy no less than in the Revised; he helped to bring them out as a member of the Liturgical Committee; and, worse still, these very features and forms were in part selected as the *special* object of his praise, in the public panegyric he saw fit to pronounce at the time on the whole work. So much for Dr. Dorner's historical accuracy in the matter.

With all this obliquity of vision in particulars, however, it is to the credit of Dr. Dorner, that he has not been able to take in the false conclusion toward which all looks through the distorted optics of Dr. Bomberger. The notion of a systematic plot and plan on the part of the Liturgical Committee to defeat the wishes of the Church, he finds too monstrous to accept; however much his borrowed version of particulars may seem otherwise to run toward this end. Speaking of my *Vindication* he says: "The historical part of this tract contains a somewhat excited defence against the charge, that the Liturgical Committee, and especially Nevin himself, had by refined management contrived, partly by delay and then again by going forward, to carry out their ritualistic views gradually in opposition to the expressed will of the Synod. This charge, from all we know of the very honorable character of Dr. Nevin, is unquestionably rash and unjust. There is no reason to doubt, that Dr. Nevin had no liturgical system of his own in the beginning; and as he came to have one more and more with the progress of the work (the result, indeed, of principles which were with

him of much older date, and closely connected probably with his hostility to the sect system and to religious subjectivism generally), he made no secret of it, we must believe, as far as it was clear to himself, before the Synod. The Synod then, also, in spite of his openly expressed convictions (without, however, thereby meaning to approve them), constantly added him anew to the Committee, as one whose talent and learning it could not afford to do without; while, however, the opposite tendency also was brought into representation. As regards the seventeen years' history of the Liturgy, therefore, we cannot join here in the moral condemnation of the conduct of the Liturgical Committee, and of Dr. Nevin. But the full significance of the controversy comes out first fairly in the *dogmatic* question: Is the new Liturgy at variance with the Evangelical and in particular the Reformed basis of doctrine? Should that be so, the work must, in such view, be condemned."

This, as all may easily see, is sufficiently slipshod and lame. But I allow it to pass; and along with it dismiss now the whole narrative portion of Dr. Dorner's article. He appears to bad advantage in it as a historian. This is owing to distance, and the use of a wretchedly poor telescope. It will be more interesting, as well as more to the point, to hear what he has to say in the farther progress of his article as a theologian. There, at least, we can hope to find him in the use of his own eyes; and may respectfully reverence his opinions, even while we earnestly dispute their force.

III. GOD MANIFESTED IN CHRIST.

In passing forward to his criticism of the second part of my *Vindication*, that which is devoted to the theology of the Liturgy, Dr. Dorner does me the justice to quote largely and fairly from the tract itself. A very different treatment, indeed, from that of which I have to complain on the part of certain less learned controversialists in this country; who too commonly make it their business, *not* to let me speak for myself, but to charge upon me garbled or perverted misconstructions (either their own or borrowed from some other irresponsible outside

source), which they find it then an easy task to demolish with sarcasm or show of argument, as to their fancy may seem best. Dorner knows nothing of such disingenuous, dastardly behavior. His polemics are honorable and fair. He takes up the characteristics I give of what is called the Mercersburg Theology; and without copying what I say in full, offers to his German readers such an ample and truthful synopsis of my statements, that I have no reason whatever to complain of the representation, as being either defective or suited to mislead. He comprehends what he undertakes in this way to report; and he shows himself, at the same time, able to report intelligibly and faithfully for others. In these circumstances, his criticisms also, whether right or wrong, are no less intelligible and relevant. They are not rigmarole declamation merely, put forward for popular effect. They carry with them point and purpose; and form real and substantial questions, on which it is possible to join issue in a real and substantial way. Altogether this is, as I have said before, refreshing and satisfactory. The argument before us is, in this way, lifted above the sphere of personal interest and passion. It is in the service only, and for the sake, of Christian truth.

The first point Dorner makes with my characterization of our theology, is where he brings in what I say of the Christocentric stand-point, as being the *only* one from which we can have a just apprehension of Christianity. Let me quote here in full from the *Vindication* on this subject:

"No other stand-point can be substituted for it (the Christocentric) without boundless error and confusion. It is possible to bring in here a different centre of observation; nay, it is the natural vice of our fallen reason, that it tends continually to throw itself upon a different centre; for the full practical sense of what Christ is, in this respect, belongs only to the world of faith, which as such is, at the same time, the world of what transcends all natural reason. We may have a simply anthropological divinity—a mere humanitarian theology; all centring in the idea of man (anthropocentric); the earth again ruling the heavens, and the merely moral or ethical at best playing itself off as the divine. Or we may have, on the other hand, a sim-

ply theological divinity—a construction of theology starting from the idea of God, considered absolutely and outside of Christ (theocentric); in which the relations of God to the world, then, will become pantheistic, fantastic, visionary, and unreal; and all religion will be made to resolve itself at last into metaphysical speculations or theosophic dreams. How far these false projections of Christian doctrine, in one view antagonistic, and yet in another everlastingly intermarried, have made themselves mischievously felt in the Christian world, through all Protean forms and shapes, from their first bad birth as Ebionism and Gnosticism, down to the Socinianism, Anabaptism, and metaphysical Calvinism of the sixteenth century, and down still farther to corresponding forms of religious thought in our own time—this is not the proper place to inquire. Our object is simply to fix attention on the possibility of such wrong constructions of Christianity, for the purpose of insisting with more effect on the necessity of a construction that shall start from the right point of observation; and to make fully apparent, moreover, how much is comprehended in what we say, when we affirm that this right point of observation is the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that no theology, therefore, can be either safe or sound, or truly Christian, which does not show itself to be in this view a truly Christocentric theology."

On this Dorner remarks, in a note: "*These are assertions without proof. From God, in any case, must Christology, as well as Anthropology, proceed. Nevin talks as though there could be no conception of God save as in hostility to Christology; or as if Christianity did not bring us the true self-evidencing idea of God, in the light of which then again Christ himself is to be viewed; as without the general idea of God also, we cannot come to Christ.*"

I have been greatly surprised, I confess, as I doubt not many readers of the *Messenger* will be also, on reading these words. Who would have expected to find Dr. Dorner, the great German Christologist, gravely questioning the truth of the proposition, that there can be no starting point of Christianity, no beginning or actual origination either of Christian knowl-

edge or of Christian life, except in the person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ! Yet this is what he does in the note just quoted, pronouncing what I say of Christ's central and fundamental relation to all Christian truth to be assertion without proof, and maintaining that Christianity has its ground and beginning in the idea of God, which is older and wider than the fact of the Incarnation.

Now we all know, of course, that God in His absolute character, is the ground ontologically of the whole creation. Of Him, through Him, and to Him, as the Apostle says, are all things. In Him, all live, move, and have their being. Every Christian child knows this. He is the foundation in this view of the new creation, as well as of the old creation. If there were no God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to be revealed through His Son, there could be no Christ, no Son, to make him known. These are simple truisms which admit of no dispute.

Again, there is a sense also, in which the absolute being of God, as related immediately and directly to our created being, must be considered the necessary ground of our *knowing* Him, and coming into union with Him, in the way of religion. The whole possibility of religion for us starts in the God-consciousness, or direct sense of Deity, which is as much a part of our original nature, as the sense we have of the world around us or of our own existence. It is not put into us by any outward evidence or argument. It authenticates and necessitates itself as a fundamental fact in our life; and in doing this it certifies, to the same extent, the truth of the object on which it is exercised. Or rather, we must say, the truth of the object on which it is exercised, which is the Divine Being, or the existence of the Absolute, certifies itself, makes itself sure in and through the consciousness into which it thus enters. In this sense, the idea of God comes before Christianity, as it comes before religion in every other form. But who will say, that this general idea of God can be for us, therefore, the actual root of Christianity; so that any among us starting with that alone, could ever by means of it come to a full construction of what God is for true Christian faith? It lies at the ground of pan-

theism, dualism, polytheism, deism, and all false religions, no less than at the ground of Christianity. For the distinctive knowledge of Christianity, then, we need some other specific principle or root, which however it may be comprehended in the general principle of all religion, must be regarded at the same time, nevertheless, as the ground and beginning, exclusively and entirely, of religion under this its highest and only absolutely complete form.

Where now is that principle to be found? Where does the whole world of Christianity, the new creation of the Gospel (life, power, doctrine, and all), take its rise and start? Where do we come to the source of its perennial revelation, the ground of its indestructible life? Where, save in the presence of the Word Incarnate, the glorious Person of Him, who is the "Root and the Offspring of David, the bright and morning Star—the Faithful and True Witness, the BEGINNING of the Creation of God!"

Yes; even the natural creation springs from Him as its archetypal source in God. By Him, and through Him, God made the worlds. "He is before all things, and by Him (literally ἐν αὐτῷ, *in Him*) all things consist"—συνέστηκε, stand together as in their common root. Or as we have it just before, "He is the first-born of the whole creation; for by Him (again strictly *in Him*, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα) were all things created" (Col. i. 15–17). Thus to understand the world of nature itself, the only stand-point of right study and observation is that which is set before us in what we may call the *Logology* of St. John, the doctrine of the Divine Logos or Word as we have it proclaimed in the beginning of his Gospel. Here we must take our position by faith, and not in the idea of God simply as the absolute ground and beginning of all things, to have any just apprehension at all of the relation in which the world stands to Him; so as to avoid the error of pantheism on the one hand, and the no less serious error of a mere abstract dualistic deism on the other. For want of this, the old Grecian cosmogonies ran into interminable bewilderment and nonsense; and without it, both the philosophical thinking and the unphilosophical popular thinking of our own time, show themselves full as pow-

erless to grasp the true mystery of creation, in the form in which we have it declared by St. Paul: "Through faith we *understand* (νοοῦμεν, inwardly see), that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." (Heb. xi. 3.)

But if the natural world be thus rooted and grounded in the Eternal Logos, how much more earnestly and strongly must we not insist upon the parallel truth of the Gospel, that the whole being of Christianity, the new world of grace in which only the world of nature itself becomes complete, is rooted and grounded in like manner in the Incarnation of the same Divine Logos, whereby He became man for us men and for our salvation? This fact, the Incarnation, is comprehended, of course, in the eternal generation of the Son, as that again holds only in the absolute Being of God; in other words, the principle of Christianity is comprehended in the principle of the creation, and the principle of the creation again finds its deepest and last ground in the idea of God as the First Cause of all things. But none the less for this reason is the principle of Christianity, in its own form, the generating and producing source of all that belongs specifically to this new creation; so as to make it impossible, that the same should ever be at all understood or apprehended in any other way than through its guidance and illumination. Nay, as the ultimate sense of all going before, it is easy to see, that this last fact, the coming of Christ in the flesh, must indeed be regarded as the only sole orb of light, that can flood with any true intelligence either the older ways of God or the being and character of God in any other view.

This is what I have meant, in maintaining, that the only right point of observation for the knowledge of Christianity is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and "that no theology, therefore, can be either safe or sound, or truly Christian, which does not show itself to be in this view a truly Christocentric theology." It did not enter into my mind, that any one could question the truth of the statement made in these general terms; and so I added: "The proposition needs no proof. It is a first principle, a self-evident axiom, in Christianity. To doubt it,

is to call Christ Himself into doubt." After which, however, I still went on to offer, in summary quotation from the New Testament, what I then considered, and fully as much now consider, unanswerable authority for all I had said; as any one can see who chooses to look at the 58th and 59th pages of my tract. But now here, in the face of all, we have no less a man than Dr. Dorner proclaiming by his mere *ipse dixit* in a note: *These are assertions without proof!* Alas, what does this whole contradiction, preferred in such dogmatic style, mean?

"Assertions without proof," indeed! As if the whole New Testament were not one broad evidence of their truth. As if the Person of Immanuel were not itself at once their overwhelming argument and demonstration.

The conception of God outside of the Incarnation is not necessarily hostile to this mystery, I have said nothing of that sort. But such general conception can never of itself be for us what God is through the Incarnation. Neither have I said or implied, that "Christianity does not bring us the true self-evidencing idea of God in the light of which Christ then is to be viewed," in order that we may come to Him fully. On the contrary, that is just what I most earnestly affirm. The question regards not the being of God, absolutely considered, but the *revelation* of God, by and through which we are brought to know Him as He is. Certainly the idea of God meets us, with its own self-evidencing light, in Christianity, as it meets us nowhere else. But how is it, and where is it, that we thus come into its glorious light? Most assuredly only in and through Christ Himself. His own presence it is alone, that serves to bring into view the idea of God, the truth of His existence, the glory of His perfections, the fullness of His grace, as it is not possible for the heart of man to conceive of all this in any other way. In this Divine light then, indeed, the full glory of His own Person also is revealed. He shines as the Brightness of God. But still He does so only as He is the medium and organ of God's self-manifestation; and so it remains true to the end, that whatever God is for faith or knowledge in Christianity, He is all solely and entirely through His Son, "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary."

Now this is just what I have meant, in saying, that Christianity centres in Christ; and that the *Christocentric* position, therefore, where we are brought to take our stand by faith in the mystery of the Word made Flesh, is the only right and sure point of observation for taking in the true sense of the Gospel, or for understanding the true economy of the world in any view whatever.

What else is it than this, when Christ is said to be the "image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15)—the "brightness of His glory and the express image of His Person" (Heb. i. 3); when God is said to give us "the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6); when the full understanding and acknowledgment of the "mystery of God" is affirmed to be by Christ, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 2, 3)? But why multiply such quotations? "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven" (John iii. 13). "No man knoweth who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal Him" (Luke x. 22). "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by ME." "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen *Me* hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?" (John xiv. 6, 9).

This surely is *Christocentric* theology. Will Dr. Dorner wave it aside as "assertion without proof?"

IV. DORNER'S THEOLOGICAL POSITION.

Having completed his fair and satisfactory sketch of what I say, in my *Vindication*, on the first general characteristic of the Mercersburg theology, Dr. Dorner enters upon a formal criticism of it as follows:

Extract from Review.

"After this extended representation of the Christological ground thought, let me be allowed to add some remarks. One can rejoice from the heart, certainly, in the glowing and vigor-

ous confession of great truths which is contained in what is here spoken. But taking into consideration the appeal made to my writings by Dr. Nevin at the General Synod of Dayton, an exposition is required on several points, comprehended in his view; points, where our ways no longer go together, since Dr. Nevin is led by them to propositions in regard to the *Church*, which seem to me not rightly deduced, and even no longer evangelical, and which he must himself have felt to be objectionable if he had held the principle of the Reformation in its full significance and force.

"We begin with what he says on *right position* in regard to the object, for seeing as it were under right point of view the things of Christianity as they are in truth. This right point of view now, from which only the centre is to be clearly distinguished from its radii and periphery, is according to common Reformation doctrine the right personal disposition and capacity of man—in one word *faith*, the necessary presupposition of all sound Christian knowledge. Such faith has in the Evangelical Church its most intensive and purest idea and form; and this, as faith in redemption (above all, justification) through Christ. This faith includes in it the Divine assurance of salvation given in the God-man; in the consciousness of redemption and its truth, is implanted principally at the same time, and with *one* stroke, consciousness of the Redeemer and of His dignity and truth. It is Pelagian, to affirm any true and sure knowledge of Christ, before the experience of this redeeming power. A pretended knowledge *before* such personal experience is only the reflection in us of a foreign faith or knowledge; in truth, however laudable in its place, bare authority-faith. In difference from this, through the proper cognition of faith, in the way of religious experience, the believer is raised above all mere human authority, as for example that of the Church; nay, even above the merely outward authority of the Holy Scriptures themselves: as having now experienced in himself, through the Holy Ghost, that the Word of God in the Scriptures, or in the mouth of the Church, is the truth. Faith thus, in the evangelical sense, is the position or point of view, from

which the true essence of Christianity is to be known. Nay, faith is itself the eye also, or organ, for such knowledge. But what is thus made sure to faith as its own contents, is already *in nuce* the whole of Christianity, both in its objective and in its subjective wealth.

"Quite otherwise, so far as we can see, Dr. Nevin. Of the Reformation faith he has, in this decisive passage, nothing to say. Christ is for him the self-evident centre of Christianity; and nothing is said of the necessity of conversion, here where the subject is in hand, for gaining the proper condition and basis of true knowledge, as if every man in Christendom must understand of himself, that Christ is this centre. Instead of giving us in the first place a doctrine of the way in which a man becomes a Christian (a phenomenology of faith and a theory of Christian knowledge), and showing how in the certainty which faith has of the truth, both the organ and principle are given for our ever widening range of Christian knowledge; instead of this, we say, he puts the Christology immediately into front view as a primordial and central truth. The telescope of Christian inquiry, with him, has not the Christology for its *object*, in order to find in it the centre of the whole; it is made to be the presupposition, one knows not how reached, for the Christian thinking itself. In this lies, to my mind, a methodical fault, which has great consequences for all that follows. The Christology, and this at once also in the sharply defined dogmatic form, in which it has come to be understood only as the result of long historical labor, is here withdrawn from scientific investigation and construction altogether; whereas it ought rather to form the unchangeable presupposition of all dogmatic theology. Whilst in fact God and man precede the Incarnation, and furnish in their separate natures the elements from which first a Christology is to be brought to pass, this is here made to be itself the primordial centre, out of which all flows objectively as well as for knowledge; as if Christ might be called the condition also of God, or as though the Church were Christ. If it be said, however, that only the germ of a Christology, and not such a doctrine in full form, is

required in order to a theological system, we put the question: How do we come then even to this germ? Nevin's answer may be: Through the Church, which carries Christ in it. But in a theological system, we have to do with truth and its assurance. Do we reach these, then, through the authority of the Church and its attestation? In that case, we have in principle abandoned the evangelical ground, and the Church is placed after all above Christ and His Spirit, as accrediting Christ. Should he answer, however, with the Evangelical Church: By the self-authenticating power of the objective truth itself through the Holy Ghost—he must not forget that this is not experienced by every one, since otherwise all would have it who hear the Word. Thus, while all are held bound fast in like sin and unbelief, those only come to the assurance in question in whose persons a change has preceded by conversion and faith. In and by their redemption do they first become aware and sure of Christ as the Redeemer, and this is thus an indispensable condition of their true knowledge. Yea, this factor of the personal assurance of objective truth through faith is of such weight, that it carries with it the right of critical inquiry concerning the sacred canon and its consistency with itself, as also especially the right of sitting in judgment on doctrinal productions and on the Church.

"Nevin, on the contrary, takes the ancient, in part anti-Reformation position, in such sort, that the dogmatic productions of the ancient Church, in their simply objective character, form for him unawares the basis and condition of his system; that he says nothing of the fundamental significance of faith for an evangelical system of faith; and that it seems not even to have entered his mind, that in an evangelical system of faith strictly taken nothing has found its place fully, which has not yet gone through the experience of faith and in this way received its authentication for personal assurance.

"Modern theology, viewed from this point, falls into three main orders or divisions. The *first* looks upon the old œcumenical symbols of the Church as the absolutely immovable foundation of the Church, little caring to inquire how we have come to the assurance of their contents, and little concerned

when the authority of the Church is exhibited as the ultimate warrant of belief; in this way, denying the evangelical ground of faith. The *second* seeks to take position in the Reformation, for which the personal assurance of salvation in Christ and of the truth was of supreme account; but through fear of prejudicing in any way the full freedom of the subjective side recognizes no immutable objective as given in the Scriptures, disowning as foreign or unessential all that has not come within the scope of its own antecedent religious experience. So in particular it proceeds with what are called objective doctrines, and with a portion at least of the œcumenical confessions. Both these divisions are unhistorical. The last breaks at once with the entire pre-Reformation Church and life, which it regards as having been only a grand aberration. The more, however, it loses the firm substance of stable Christian objectivity, so that even the canon ceases to be canonical for it through its contents, the more does it lose also both Christian assurance and Christian faith. For to both belongs an inward *substance*, to which they refer themselves. The same process repeats itself theologically here, which we have in the one-sided movement of the subjective philosophy ending in Fichte. But the first division is also in its way unhistorical and revolutionary; because it *breaks with the Reformation*, and its demand for the free personal appropriation of truth, and makes but small account of the need of salvation and truth. It springs over the Reformation, that work of God, in which the Church mounted to a higher stage in the appropriation of Christian truth, in order to fall back at once and immediately to the ancient Church. We will not say that this is necessarily Romanizing; but even if errors, specifically Roman, may be (by inconsequence) happily avoided, such a theology acquires so much the more an Oriental type; it must place the Divine institution of the Church higher than the faith, with which in the Reformation view the Church first properly begins, and that will show itself unavoidably in sacramental hierarchical views.

"The method of Nevin would be allowable, if the theological subject and object were identical, so that the believer might say, I am Christ, and the Church is simply the *Christus expli-*

citus; or if the principle of doctrinal knowledge and the principle of actual existence were the same. When the subjective side is thus crowded out of its proper place by the Christian object, the consequence is that religion or faith and theology are confounded, and the last (as happens unpleasantly with Nevin himself against his adversaries) is handled as if it were religion itself. If Nevin would take faith in the evangelical sense as the preliminary condition of theology, and would represent scientifically the factors of which it is composed, he would find the true union of its subjective and objective constituents in the conjunction of faith with Holy Scripture, but see at the same time that in the systematic exhibition of the contents of faith more than *one* method is admissible. For how should it not answer for example, to make God the beginning of a dogmatic system, without prejudice to the idea of Christ; although on the other side that also has its right, that we are brought to the Father through the Son? Such a system now, however, might well be called theocentric; and with it might well be joined the view also, that in Christ God is not simply (as before Christ) the centre of nature, as also of general and Old Testament history, in His character of *Logos*, but becomes the centre also of a kingdom of grace and glory.

"Over against the two grand divisions of modern theology now described, then, there stands of right a *third*, which alone can be said to have the promise of a future. That is *the* theology, which *genuinely historical* breaks neither with the Ancient Church nor with the Reformation, but stands in essential harmony with both, and seeks to understand accordingly the continuity of the life of the Church. It is in the nature of things, that as children of the Reformation we proceed from the Reformation stand-point; that we lay all stress thus in particular on the free conscious personal apprehension of salvation and Christian truth; an end, which, in the way of all teleology, must work back into the beginning, also, and hold at a distance there whatever may be at war with this end, the authority of the Church for example, regarded as the ultimate seal of truth. So far as this goes, the Church has passed with the Reforma-

tion (as compared with the Christological and Trinitarian period) into the Anthropological and Soteriological stadium. But she has not hereby, by any means, become anthropocentric in the sense of Dr. Nevin. The faith which brings salvation with its free personal appropriation and assurance, cannot come into exercise, except as the *object* it is to embrace is offered to it for this purpose through the Holy Scriptures and the preaching of them by the Church; and the substance of the plain Gospel thus preached through Scripture or Church, as it is comprised for example in the Apostles' Creed, has power in it to make itself evident to the penitent, believing mind. But with this there is given at once also a real identity, not only with the old Christian faith of the Creed, but as far as theological consciousness is unfolded with the Trinitarian and Christological decisions likewise of the Ancient Church; which form thus a rich and valuable inheritance, although, as regards the precise details of church doctrine, it is to be entered upon only *sous le bénéfice de l'inventaire*. That involves, it is true, the right of evangelical faith to sit in judgment on ecclesiastical doctrinal decisions, and so a recognition of the fallibility of the Church in herself, which will not allow her to be considered the highest authority in matters of religion; but then is is only that faith which is demonstrably in harmony with Scripture, that can legitimately exercise any such criticism over the Church."

A General Observation.

Thus far Dr. Dorner. I have thought it well to give in full his criticism on this part of my tract; both to do him justice, and to bring fairly and clearly into view the interesting and important subject on which he has here taken pains to declare his mind. What such a man has to say on the principle of Protestantism is entitled always to respectful hearing and consideration. As this extract, however, reaches so far, it must be allowed now to form by itself the body of the present article; while I reserve to myself the right of answering it in my next communication. In the meantime, it is commended to the careful study of the readers of the *Messenger* generally.

They may see from it the magnitude and solemnity of the discussion with which it is concerned; its theoretical difficulties; its far-reaching practical applications. Let them be well assured, that it is eminently worthy of their closest and most earnest attention.

One general observation, however, I may be allowed to make here, in view of the whole argument which I have now taken the trouble of translating from Dorner's review.

The argument rests on premises and views, very different from those that govern the thinking of the party in this country, which is industriously trying to make capital out of it now at my expense. For the party in question, indeed, this is of the smallest imaginable account. It is only in keeping with the tactics it has seen fit to pursue generally, in contending *manfully* for the faith once delivered to the saints. All weapons, no matter from what foreign ecclesiastical armory or camp, have been made welcome, which could by any possibility carry with them what seemed a temporary edge against my views, by either direct or cross, cut or thrust, in any and every direction. Any authority, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, or even Roman Catholic itself, has been considered good and sound *as against Mercersburg*. Why, then, should not all account be made of Dorner's unfavorable criticism also for the same purpose? No one could expect anything else. Who of this guerilla band, this bushwhacking Morgan's corps, cares a fig for Dorner's theological status in any other view? Still this is no reason why attention should not be called to the fact now stated. It may be of some interest to the friends of truth, even though it be of none to the friends of error.

The whole theological position of Dr. Dorner, even as brought out by the extract now quoted, is different from that of his admirers in this country, who are now bent on making him a *coryphaeus* for the American German Reformed Church; and the difference is such, as, under other circumstances (exhibited, for example, in our new Liturgy or in the *Mercersburg Review*), could not fail to draw upon itself their heavy censure and animadversion. Let it suffice to instance in the following particulars:

1. Dorner holds, in the first place, that Protestantism is *historical*, in the sense of being the legitimate succession of the previous life of the Church back to the time of the Apostles. The only theology which has the promise of the future, he tells us, is that which neither ignores the Reformation of the 16th century, nor yet makes it the birth of a new Christianity, but seeks to maintain the proper continuity of the Christian faith and life by joining the Reformation with Primitive Christianity, so that they may appear one with full justice to both. Now this is just what we, as a Church, have been reaching after, in our Liturgy and in all our theology. Dorner may not like exactly *our* way of joining the two periods. Still he is of one mind with us plainly, as regards general theory and object. But in this he differs *toto cœlo* from his American would-be cousins; as well as from the universal Babylon of sects they here represent—of which, it is only too plain, our good Dr. Dorner knows next thing to nothing. It is the glory of this whole school to be perfectly unhistorical. The beginning and end of their Protestantism is simply *Delenda est Carthago*, hurled forever against Catholicism and all Christianity older than the 16th century.

2. Then, in the next place, Dorner proceeds throughout, as I have had occasion to remark before, on the assumption that Protestantism, in its historical character, has been itself also a *moving* fact from the beginning (in the general movement of the world's life); that it has in this way parted with very much in form which belonged to it originally; that it requires now broad reconstruction, to conserve and maintain its first substance; and that this can never be done at all by any repristination simply of old terminology or old modes of theological thought. He will not hear of a mechanical, but only of a dynamical resurrection, for the orthodoxy of the Reformation age either Lutheran or Reformed. How little this agrees with the prating of our American resurrectionists on this subject, whose whole learning consists in digging up the mere bones and dust of that buried time, and trying to pass them off as its veritable life, all who choose to look at the matter can easily see.

3. The whole idea of a regenerated Protestantism, in the third place, as held by Professor Dorner, is predicated on the common German view, that much of the orthodox thinking of the 16th and 17th centuries was both *philosophically and theologically wrong*. That its doctrine of God, for example, and His relations to the world, was not rightly digested; that the true conception of revelation in its historical character, was not reached by it; that it had no proper sense, therefore, of the relation of Judaism and the Old Testament to Christianity and the New Testament; that its theory of inspiration, in particular, was mechanical and wholly unsound. That its supernaturalism altogether, in a word, was dualistic and magical, and in this way at bottom irrational and fairly open to the assaults of Rationalism; which had a right, therefore, to triumph over it, as it did triumph over it in fact, in the deluge of subjectivity (intellectual, sentimental, and moral), with which all was hopelessly submerged in the 18th century. This is the German *Evangelical* theory. This is the theory in which Dr. Dorner openly stands, as any one can see in his late History of Protestantism. Now I pass no judgment upon it here. That is not my business at present. I only say, that it is brimful of heresy, as measured from the stand-point of those among ourselves who are now ready to magnify Dorner as their great Apollo against Mercersburg. *Their* stand-point is that of our American *Evangelicalism* generally; and it involves precisely, that whole scheme of one-sided, abstract supernaturalism, which Dorner thinks went down like a foundering ship in the floods and billows of German unbelief at the close of the last century; making room, only through its own vast and terrible wreck, for the resuscitation of the old faith now in new and better form!

4. Once more: Dr. Dorner tells us plainly, that the material principle of Protestantism, justifying faith, the right of the Christian believing personality, is so *independent* in its own order, that it may bring to its critical bar, not only the authority of the Church, and all Christian tradition, but the sense of Scripture, also, and the canonical authority of the Bible. It may exercise here still the same freedom that Luther exercised,

for example, when he pronounced the Epistle of St. James an epistle of straw, and charged St. Paul with false logic in the Epistle to the Galatians. Now here, as before, I simply state Dorner's view, without passing upon it at present any judgment. But how does all this, it may well be asked again, fall in with the ordinary Evangelical thinking of this country? Such a view of saving faith, as exalted above the Church, cannot fail, of course, to be pleasing to it: but what of the exaltation of faith above the Scriptures? Can that also be pleasing to it? Not certainly in Dorner's sense. Our American Puritanism, in all its forms, affect, to build its religion wholly and exclusively on the Bible. That is for it the pillar and ground of the truth, the beginning and the *ne plus ultra* of all sure and orthodox belief. In other words, it puts the formal principle of the Reformation into the place of its material principle; the very error again in which Dorner sees the rise and growth of the great Protestant apostacy of the last century; and the full surmounting of which he holds to be now the first condition of that great Protestant restoration, which is, in his view, the problem and task of the present century.

V. CHRISTOLOGICAL VIEW OF FAITH.

I come now to consider Dr. Dorner's strictures on my view of the central relation of Christ to Christianity, as they have been quoted at large in my last article.

He charges me, in general terms, with confounding subjective and objective in my way of looking at Christianity; and thinks that I fail, on this account, to distinguish properly between religion or faith and theology—making the last to be religion itself; as if the principle of doctrinal knowledge here, he says, and the principle of actual being or existence, were one and the same.

Now I can only say, that the two are for my own mind perfectly distinct; and that I have never supposed myself at all to be confounding them in the way thus laid to my charge.

I must confess, however, on the other hand, that I look upon them as most intimately related; in such sort that there can be no proper theology, no knowledge of what Christianity is scien-

tifically, which is not based upon the sense of what it is in the way of some actual religious experience. "Theology," says Martensen, "is not only a science *of* or concerning faith, but also a knowledge *in* faith and *out of* faith." In this view, when we go back far enough, the knowledge-principle and the being-principle here *do* meet together in a wonderfully significant way. Saving faith is the beginning of all evangelical knowledge. Subject and object are inseparably conjoined, where such faith becomes for the soul the germinant power of a true Christian life. They are not to be confounded with one another, certainly, as if they were identical; but just as little may they be sundered and held apart, as if one could exist and be of force without the other.

It is not to be imagined, of course, that Dr. Dorner would dispute this; and yet he seems to me, strangely enough, to lose sight of it in his criticism now under consideration.

If I understand him rightly, he has it in his mind, that when I affirm the Person of Christ to be the only right stand-point for seeing Christianity in proper view, and understanding it properly, I must mean to assert the necessity of some Christological theory, some scientific or dogmatic apprehension in the first place of what is comprehended in the constitution of His Person, as a sort of intellectual preparation for such Christocentric knowledge of the Gospel. But I need not say, that this is as far as anything well could be from my real meaning in all I have ever been trying to say on the subject.

In opposition to any such theoretic or intellectual position, now, which I am supposed to insist upon, Dr. Dorner gravely tells us: "The right point of view, from which only the centre is to be clearly distinguished from the radii and periphery, is according to common Reformation doctrine, the right personal disposition and capacity of man—in one word, *faith*, the necessary presupposition of all sound Christian knowledge. Such faith has in the Evangelical Church its most intensive and purest idea and form; and this, as faith in redemption (above all, justification) through Christ." Again: "It is Pelagian to affirm any true and sure knowledge of Christ, *before* the experi-

ence of His redeeming power;" as if in some way *my* Christo-centric theory involved that. And so it follows: "Quite otherwise, so far as we can see, Dr. Nevin. Of the Reformation faith he has, in this decisive passage, nothing to say. Christ is for him the self-evident centre of Christianity; and nothing is said of the necessity of conversion, here where the subject is in hand, for gaining the proper condition and basis of true knowledge, as if every man in Christendom must understand of himself that Christ is this centre."

Now this is truly amazing. Where have I ever said a word to imply, that the knowledge of Christ can be brought into us otherwise than through *faith?* Have I not been insisting all along on the necessity of having such faith toward Christ to start with, for any true and right apprehension of the Gospel? What else than this can I have meant, by gathering up the sense of the Creed continually into that fundamental confession of St. Peter: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God? Where have we, if not here, the true conception of faith (God-wrought in the soul), in distinction from all mere ratiocination or outward tradition (of flesh and blood origin); commended to us as it is by the solemn congratulation of the Saviour Himself?

Not to speak now of other utterances, made by me over and over again on this subject, which Dr. Dorner may never have had the opportunity of seeing, what are we to think of his overlooking, in the very passage itself which he is here criticising as of such *decisive* significance, the following plain language:

"As an object of *faith* and knowledge, and in the only form in which it can be regarded as having reality in the world, Christianity has been brought to pass through the mystery of the incarnation, and stands perpetually in the presence and power of this fact. All its verities, all its doctrines, all its promises, all its life-giving forces, root themselves continually in the undying life of Him who thus became man for us men and for our salvation. And such being the actual *objective* constitution of Christianity, it would seem to be at once plain that our *apprehension* of it, to be either right or safe, must

move in the same order. It must plant itself boldly and broadly on the proposition, that Jesus Christ is the principle of Christianity, and that the full sense of the Gospel is to be reached only in and through the revelation which is comprehended in His glorious Person. In doing this, it will become necessarily such a theology, such a way of looking at the Christian salvation, as we are now trying to describe. Learned or unlearned, it will be a theology that revolves around Christ as a centre, and is irradiated at all points by the light that flows upon it from His presence." *Vind.*, p. 55.

Again: "How then, having such objective constitution, and standing thus actually and entirely in the historical being of Christ, beyond which it must necessarily resolve itself into nothing, as having no *basis of faith* whereon to rest; being in such sort bound to Christ, we repeat, as the Alpha and Omega, sum and substance, of its whole existence, how possibly shall Christianity be studied and understood aright, either practically or doctrinally, either as a system of life or as a system of theology, if it be not in the Christocentric way of which we are now speaking? To comprehend the world which grace has made, we must take *our position by faith* in the great primordial centre from which all has been evolved, and *there* fixing our spiritual telescope, endeavor, as best we may, to scan the wonders thus offered to our contemplation." *Vind.*, *p.* 59.

How *could* Dr. Dorner say in the face of this, that the centrality here claimed for Christ, as the self-evident origination of Christianity, shuts out the fundamental significance of *faith* in its Reformation sense; when the very purpose of the whole representation is to show, that what the Gospel is objectively in the Christocentric view, it must be also as mirrored in our apprehension of it—which it cannot be, except as we *take our position by faith* in the actual centre itself (Christ Jesus) from which all flows!

It really seems at times, as if Dr. Dorner, in his zeal for the autonomic character of justifying faith, the independence of the material principle of Protestantism (as against both Church and Bible), were disposed to resolve all Christianity into the action

simply of our human subjectivity in this form. Our faith, he says, is the only right viewing point from which to understand Christianity as if we could have this somehow, without *being* in Christianity: as if it were possible for faith to be in us, and yet not be at once the comprehension and power of its object in us at the same time.

This, of course, is *not* what Dorner means. Faith with him is more than a strong self-persuasion merely of inward justification, in any Anabaptist or common Methodistical sense; however much his language sounds occasionally that way. He tells us explicitly, that it has power and reality only through what it lays hold of as its object. It is thus subjective and objective both together. But there is after all, I cannot help feeling, a certain amount of confusion, in the way in which the objective factor is brought in by him to complement the subjective.

Sometimes he speaks of the complementing factor, as if it were simply the Holy Scriptures in the most general sense. Then again, however, it is made to be Divine Revelation, the substantial matter back of the Written Word, which faith has to do with directly in a sense that gives the principle authority co-ordinate with that of the Bible itself. But such revelation, it is seen, must come to its completion in Christ and it is in Him only therefore at last, that faith finds its full object. This now would seem of itself to bring us to the Christocentric view, which Dorner so strangely seeks to avoid. But here again we meet with new confusion.

As the power of our justification, faith has to do primarily, we are told, with the atoning righteousness of Christ; it is the meeting in us of the subjective consciousness of guilt and condemnation, with the objective presence of the satisfaction Christ has made for our sins by His death upon the cross. At times, now we have this spoken of as if it were something to be thought of, and laid hold of, in its own separate nature. But then it is felt again, that as such an abstraction the atonement can have in the end no objective reality; and so it is admitted to be of force for faith, only as it is apprehended in the living

person of the Redeemer. We have redemption through Christ's blood only *in* Christ Himself.

This seems certainly to refer the whole Christian salvation to the Mediatorial being of the Saviour, in the full sense of our Liturgy and the Creed; and I had supposed, therefore, that I was simply giving Dorner's own view of Luther's doctrine of justifying faith, when speaking of it in my article on his History of Protestantism, in the April number of the *Mercersburg Review*, I used these words:

"The only real foundation of Christianity, objectively considered, is Christ Himself. Great stress then is laid here on the thought, that justifying faith, in the Reformation sense of the term, amounted to a self-authenticating apprehension of Christ's righteousness through an actual laying hold of His person and life. In other words, that in which Christianity started within the soul, was held to be not just the idea of the atonement after all; but this idea lodged in the Incarnate Word, as the power of salvation back of all Christ's doings and merits in any other view. This is all very well, and as we believe profoundly true. The article of a standing or falling Church becomes thus Christological, in the fullest sense of the term. It centres upon the person of Christ, and has no meaning or truth in any other view. Dorner sees well, that in no other view can there be any room to speak either of theological consistency or of historical continuity for Protestantism; without this it must resolve itself into endless confusion and chaos. We may well say, therefore, that in thus maintaining the Christological sense of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, Dorner has, in truth planted himself on what must be considered the very Gibraltar of the Protestant cause, if that cause is to be defended at all on strictly Protestant ground."

I supposed, I say, that this Christological view of the Reformation doctrine was Dorner's view; and I see not yet, how any one can help getting such impression from what he says on the subject in his History of Protestant Theology; while, nevertheless, I have all along thought, and over and over again said, that the view committed him to *more* than he seemed willing to

allow, and that he was inconsistent with himself, in particular, in not carrying it out to his proper churchly consequences as we have them set forth in the Creed.

Now, however, it might almost seem, from this article in the Berlin *Jahrbücher*, that he is disposed to take back altogether what he has written on the subject in his History of Protestant Theology, and to make the atonement in some way a deeper principle than the life of the Incarnate Son of God, in and by which only we have received the atonement. Dorner surely, cannot, deliberately conceive of the incarnation or flesh-taking of Christ as a mere instrumental contrivance to make the atonement possible. Yet the way he now talks looks more or less, it must be confessed, in this direction. Altogether he lays himself open to the charge of serious inconsistency and self-contradiction. This I have felt before; but I feel it now more strongly than ever.

It is now more than before evident also, through what interest and preconception it is that the mind of our Berlin Professor is swayed out of right course, in what he has to say on this subject. It is want of full sympathy with the Creed, and want of power to accept the idea of the Church as it is there made to be an article of faith. Here it is, as he tells us, that our ways, his and mine, no longer go together; "Since Dr. Nevin," he says, "is led by them to propositions in regard to the *Church* which seem to me no longer evangelical, and which he himself must have felt to be objectionable if he had held the principle of the Reformation in its full significance and force."

That, however, is just the question between us. Must the material principle of the Reformation be so taken, that it shall be Christological only to the extent of embracing the atonement in Christ; or may it not be taken as Christological in full, by being brought to embrace at once the whole Christ and all His benefits? In the latter case it will run the same course with the Apostles' Creed, and bring us finally to its doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church.

Let me quote here, in conclusion, a remarkable passage from Dorner himself (Hist. of Prot. Theol., p. 224), which bears with

full force on the great subject here in hand, and as it seems to me yields in fact all that I have been contending for in regard to it. It is on Luther's view of the material principle of Protestantism, and reads as follows:

"Luther laid the greatest stress at all times on the assurance of salvation and of the Divine truth of Christianity. The ground certainty, on which all other certainty depends, is with him the justification of the sinner for Christ's sake apprehended by faith; of which it is only the objective statement, to say that the ground certainty with him is Christ as the Redeemer, through surrendry to whom faith has full satisfaction, and knows that it stands in the truth. The last ground of certainty, then, that through which all other truths are made certain, is for him plainly neither the authority of the Church, nor yet the authority of the canonical Scriptures handed down by the Church. Instead of this it is the *substance matter of God's Word*, which, whatever different forms it may take, is able to authenticate itself as God's Word by itself and its Divine power upon the heart. As Luther had not himself come to faith and the assurance of salvation directly by reading the Holy Scriptures, or through their authority, so neither could he allow to the sacred canon the first right to be believed; but it is the inward life of the Gospel proclamation which arrests him, when he has been first awakened to a lively sense of his need for it, and whose Divine, self-accrediting power then he experiences after having yielded himself to it in trust. Of course the Holy Scriptures contributed to the production of his faith, even if he might not have been aware of it himself as a *means of grace*. Without the presupposition, that the historical testimony of the Church concerning Christ was warranted in general as true, (and this warrant we have, at last, only through the archives of the New Testament,) he could not have performed the act of faith in the historical Christ. Without the historical witness of Christ, faith would have lacked its historically cognizable object. But, although historical faith presupposes this witness in general as credible, it is still not yet itself true saving faith, neither is this historical assurance true certainty. The Gospel as histori-

cal truth only would be something past and dead, as being a mere doctrinal system of eternal truths without life and without reference to the living person. Such is the nature of the Gospel, that it is first truly known and embraced only when Christ the historical, is apprehended at the same time as the present, and so as the always enduring also in the future; although past, yet still to-day actively alive and pointing toward the depths of an eternity whose life-forces are all in Himself. Where the substance of the historical Gospel has come to be thus apprehended in its inward nature, as at once historically real and yet everlasting, there the abode of eternal peace and of Divine life has been found; and just as little now as the sun needs the testimony of any other light to prove that it shines and throws out heat, so little can faith, made participant of the inward presence and power of truth, require their demonstration in any other form."

This is beautiful; and speaks for itself. I ask no finer exposition of what I mean by a *Christocentric* Gospel.

VI. THE CHURCH A CHRISTIAN MYSTERY.

In the progress of his criticism, Dr. Dorner comes, in the next place, to the consideration of my second characteristic of our theology, namely, its comprehension in the scheme or outline of the Apostles' Creed.

It is well, he says, that the honor of the Creed is maintained, against the wrong it has been made to suffer at the hands of Puritanism; but he objects to its being made absolutely regulative for all later confessional faith.

Here comes out now, more fully than before, the nature of the divergency he speaks of, as having place between him and myself, in our different ways of carrying out the Christological idea of the Gospel. I run it, he says, into views of the Church, which he cannot approve. But I do this, in truth, by simply following the movement of the Christological idea itself, as we have it represented in the Creed; and now, in contesting the point between us, Dorner shows himself in conflict also with the fair and proper sense of this venerable œcumenical symbol.

This at once, as all may readily see, is a powerful presumption against his general criticism.

In opposition to what I say of the necessary order of the articles of the Creed, as answering to the objective order of the Christian salvation itself, he betrays his own *divergent* theology by the following most significant and highly characteristic observation:

"*From this it would follow, that not only for us, but in and of itself, the Church, nay even the communion of saints, is at hand before the forgiveness of sins or justification; is thus at hand before the existence of believers or justified persons; which at once implies, that the Church before all is to be regarded as a sacramental, Divine institution. But such wrong estimation is contradicted plainly by the whole Apostolic symbol; since this does not begin with the Church, but with the three times repeated* Credo."

Now the amount of this evidently is, that the idea of the Church in the Creed is to be taken as of one meaning simply with the notion of a collective association of individual believers, whose existence it then follows and depends upon in a purely external way. But this most unquestionably is *not* what the idea of the Church was for the Christian world in the first ages, and *not* what it is made to be as an article of faith in the ancient Creeds.

The Church, regarded in such merely outward view, could not be the object of faith at all in the sense of the Creed. It might be the object of empirical observation, or the object of abstract reflection; something to be seen or to be thought of notionally, as we may be conversant with any other social organization; but there would be no *mystery* in it, no such presence of the supernatural, as would require for its apprehension a faculty or power transcending all natural intelligence and reason. It is not making it such a mystery, to resolve it simply into the conception of an *invisible* society as distinguished from what it is under another view as a visible society. In any case, as Dr. Dorner well knows, no such distinction entered into the thinking of the first Christian ages, and it is utterly

foreign therefore from the historical sense of the Creed. But, besides this, the distinction itself cannot be said to relieve at all the question now before us; for that regards the possibility of making a mere outward generalization the object of faith, in the same sense with the other articles of the Creed; and for this it is of no account, whether the generalization be of visible forms of existence or of such as are held to be invisible. It is an abstraction only, or a notion of our own minds, that we have to do with in either case. There may be a mystery (to be apprehended only by faith) in the regeneration of single believers, considered as belonging either to a visible or to an invisible society, but this will not make a mystery of their association in one view or the other. Assuming the existence of such separate miracles of grace, the mere classification of them under a common general conception and name (whether as visible or invisible) is no mystery whatever, and requires for its apprehension no exercise whatever of true evangelical faith. The Church in such view is at best only the putting together, and summing up of a certain number of mysterious facts (individual Christian experiences) that have become separately actual beforehand in another way altogether.

This, I am sorry to say, seems to be Dr. Dorner's view. I can make nothing else out of the criticism just quoted. As there can be no Church without believers, he argues that the existence of the Church cannot be in any sense prior to the existence of believers; and so takes it for granted, that, in the order of grace, believers come first and the Church afterwards. All real priority in the case is found in the subjective experiences of individuals; they come first of all to justifying faith and the sense of pardoned sin, in the way of independent separate conversion; and the whole being of the Church then follows, as the gathering up simply of such religious life into a collective social form. There is nothing new to us, of course, in this way of looking at the subject. It is the voice of our American Puritanism, so familiar to us on all sides. It is the *material principle* (God forbid I should say of Protestantism, but I *will* say boldly) of evangelical and rationalistic Sectarian-

ism, all the world over, In this sense only is the sect spirit ever found (for occasional dramatic effect) mouthing the Apostles' Creed, and saying with pious mental reservation, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*

Can such a man as Professor Dorner seriously imagine, that the Church under this notional character may be considered a mystery, in one line with the other mysteries of the Creed; that it is an object for supernatural faith in any such miserably dependent view; and that being of this character, then, it is out of its place, where it now stands in the Creed; being there only by accident as it were, without premeditation or design, and without any coercive reason in the objective movement of the Christian salvation itself?

Most certainly the sense which is thus forced into the Creed, is not that which the construction of the Creed itself involves. The idea of the Church, as it meets us among other fundamentals of the Christian faith in this primitive œcumenical symbol, is not that of a whole depending on its parts (in which case it would be a mere thought), but that of a whole comprehending its parts in itself, and possessing them with its presence. In other words, it is the idea of an organic whole, and not the notion of a simply mechanical whole. A mechanical whole is made up of single things or particulars, put together in a merely outward way. An organic whole on the contrary, is the union of particular existences and a general existence, through the power of a common life. In the first case the general follows the particulars and depends upon them entirely; but this is not so at all in the second case. In an organic whole the general is before the particulars, underlies them, and actually brings them to pass. True, the general in this form cannot come to any actual subsistence in the world, except through the particulars it thus brings to pass; but it is not for this reason an unsubstantial abstraction; it has a most real positive and substantive being of its own; and in the order of actual existence this comes first, and forms the only possibility, or potential reason, for all the particular existences by which it is brought into view.

Let no one say this is absurd; for we have it exemplified to our observation continually in the world of nature. Single animals and single plants are what they are everywhere, only in virtue of the generic life which belongs to them in common with other animals or plants of the same kind; and this generic life, in every case, comes in fact before the single existences, which it thus enters into and actualizes with its otherwise invisible presence and power. The race or kind cannot appear indeed, cannot become actual, except through the single creations into which it resolves itself; in the order of time, the general and the particular go together, the presence of the one is at once the presence also of the other; but for all that, in the order of being the general is the first and the particular second. In a profound sense, the life of the genus is older, deeper, and broader, than that of all the single living objects comprised in it. We all see and feel this, just as soon as we come to reflect seriously on the world around us; and our knowledge of the world is conditioned universally by our quiet admission of the philosophical fact. Our knowledge of the general life that enters into single living forms is never for us a generalization simply of these forms; never something that is felt to follow them only in the way of corollary or deduction. On the contrary, the general life is always apprehended as fundamental and first in the order of existence, so that we can be said to know and be sure of the single forms, only as we preceive them in the power of its ideal and yet all the while most real presence. We believe in the generic life first, and through that next in the particular and individual life; by means of which only, at the same time, the generic life ever comes actually into view.

With this mystery, now, everywhere before us in the world of mere nature, why should we have any difficulty in admitting a corresponding law of existence in our general human life, first in its natural condition, and then also in the condition to which it has been advanced by grace? Such undoubtedly is the view that underlies and determines the sense of the Creed, in the point which we have now under consideration, It is not neces-

sary to suppose any metaphysical reflection in the case. We have in it the intuitional logic simply of sound Christian faith. At the ground of this doctrine of the Church lies the idea of an organic redemption, answerable to the organic ruin of the race, and making room for the salvation of individual believers, just as this ruin draws after it the corruption and perdition of individual sinners. It is only through this idea of a generic redemption, indeed, that the generic character of the fall (original sin and universal bondage under the power of the Devil) can be said to come into view at all in the Creed. Here the fact of such organic general ruin, however, is solemnly recognized, in the acknowledgment of a like organic general restitution of our fallen human nature, through which alone it has become possible for men to be saved from their sins. To believe now in such an organic power of redemption, the actual presence in the world of a constitution of grace no less real than the constitution of man's fallen life on the outside of it; to believe in this as the result of Christ's victory over sin and death, the fruit of His resurrection, and the form of his presence and working in the world through the Spirit to the end of time; to believe in all this, I say, is to believe what is substantially the article of the Holy Catholic Church in the Creed. The article does not regard primarily and immediately the empirical organization of the Church at any given time. It looks to the general or universal life of Christianity (the Pentecostal *gift* of the glorified Saviour), as that, which must necessarily precede in the order of actual being all particular Christian life. This generic Gift (Eph. iv. 8–16), reaching historically through all times, is the idea of the Church, however variously actualized from age to age; and it is easy to see, why in such view it should be one of the "articles of our undoubted Christian faith" as we have them set forth in the Creed; and why also it should stand exactly where it does, in the movement of this grand old Christological confession. To be an article of faith at all, it must be where it is in the confession, and nowhere else.

Here, in its true and proper place, it meets us as a mystery,

of one order with what is represented as going before it; a mystery growing out of the general mystery of godliness (the manifestation of God in the flesh), whose living movement it is the object of the Creed to proclaim and set forth; a mystery, then, which has its necessity in this movement itself; which is postulated and demanded by it, from the first, as a part of its own self-evolving law of life and salvation; and which requires, therefore, for its apprehension the same faith, that is needed to believe in Christ's resurrection and glorification at the right hand of God, or to believe that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh at all.*

The article of the Church is not in the Creed in any way at random. Some might think it better to have the Bible in its place. But the Bible could not possibly stand here with the same inward reason or necessity for faith. There is no direct immediate connection between the sending of the Holy Ghost and the giving of the Holy Scriptures, in such sort that faith can be said to be shut up by the first to the second, as that without which the first must be felt to be unreal. It is not without reason, therefore, that the Holy Scriptures are not mentioned in the Creed. The fundamentals of Christianity, flowing forth immediately from the revelation of the Holy Trinity in and through the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, lie back of the inspired record and canon; so that in the true order of faith, the authority of the Scriptures can be only of subsequent apprehension and force; as the New Testament in fact, we know, did not originate Christianity in the beginning, but grew forth from it gradually as its Divine product and birth. For this reason, I repeat, the Bible could not stand in the Creed where the Church now stands. It is not postulated there by the movement of the Christian mystery; and so it could not be, at this stage of the movement, an article of faith at all in the sense in which faith is shut up to the other articles of the symbol in their consecutive order and place. The

* "Die Kirche," says the late Dr. Ullmann, "ist dem Christenthum nicht etwas Zufälliges, so dass sie also wohl auch hätte nicht gestiftet werden können; sondern sie ist etwas Nothwendiges. Sie ist die Erscheinungs-und Daseinsform des Christenthums selbst." Let the thoughtful consider well what this true word means.

Church, on the contrary, is there, not by accident, but through the immanent law of the Creed itself; and those who think at all that it might by any possibility be left out, and a different article (the authority of the Holy Scriptures for example) be substituted in its place, only show that they do not understand the Creed, and that it is not for them the true norm of Christian faith which it was held to be in the beginning.

Of course, then, I am not moved here at all by Dorner's objection now under consideration. Right or wrong, the Christian world had in the beginning, I must believe, that view of the relation of general Christianity to particular personal Christianity, which he tells us would imply, that the Church might exist before the existence of believers; and this view, beyond all question, rules the movement of the Apostles' Creed, demanding the exercise of faith in the Holy Catholic Church, and in the communion or common life of saints, before it asks us to believe in the forgiveness of sins. There can be no actualization of the Church in time, we know, without individual believers and saints; but for all this, there may be, and there is a priority belonging to the Church in the order of existence, in virtue of which it must be for us an object of faith before we can believe firmly in the powers and operations of the Gospel under any narrower and more particular view; just as we must believe in humanity at large (although there can be no actual humanity without particular men), *before* any particular man can be to us more than an evanescent spectre or shadow.

That the Church holds its proper place in the Apostolic symbol, and that it is there of purpose and not by accident, is rendered still farther evident by the mention which is made of its necessary distinguishing attributes. On any close consideration, it is found at once, that these, no less than the being of the Church itself, are part of its ideal character; and that they have their necessity for faith, therefore from the general nature of Christianity as this goes before in the person and work of Christ, and not at all from any empirical observation of its following fruits. Faith does not wait to find the attributes of the Church exemplified in the society of believers under any actual

historical form. The attributes are in the idea with *a priori* necessity and force; so that to believe in the Church at all, is to believe in it at the same time as *One*, as *Holy*, as *Catholic*, or *Universal*, and also with the Creed of Nice as *Apostolical*. These distinctions are not factitious or arbitrary in any way. The obligation to believe them lies in the Christian mystery itself; just as this mystery binds us to believe the descent to hades or the second advent, not on other evidence primarily, but through the force of the Christological movement itself, in which they are comprehended. In this view, the attributes themselves are mysteries for faith, and not matters for speculation or opinion. We do not come to the knowledge of them through any outward reflection or observation, through any study of actual church life or ecclesiastical history; but are shut up to them from the start as original conditions or postulates, without which the Church can be for us no object of faith whatever. Let any one consider this, and he must see at once what a dislocation of the Creed it would be, if the article of the Church were made to come after the mention of individual salvation, instead of going before it and making room for it, as it does in the way it now stands.

But all this is to make the Church, Professor Dorner tells us, "a sacramental, Divine institution." It is to do that most assuredly, since otherwise it could have no right to challenge the faith of the world as it has been doing through all ages in the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds. As a mere human visible society, or as a mere human invisible conception, how could it have its place rightly among the other fundamentals of Christianity here brought into view, which *all* represent to us the presence of the supernatural in the Gospel brought near to us sacramentally through natural forms. Certainly the Church is a Divine institution. It is the Ascension gift of the Risen Son of God. Its functions, offices, and powers, are of Divine origin and force. In this view its presence in the world also is sacramental. For is it not the Body of Christ, in and through which He works supernaturally by His Spirit to the end of time? Dr. Dorner altogether argues quite too loosely, it seems to me, in

the use of these ambiguous terms *sacrament* and *sacramental.* But as we are to meet them hereafter again on the subject of the Christian Ministry, I shall say nothing farther in regard to them at the present time.

Why the Creed should be taken by Dr. Dorner to contradict this view of the Church, because it does not put it before its threefold confession of the Holy Trinity, I am not able, I confess, to see or understand. The Church is in no sense the origin and beginning of Christianity; it flows from the redemption of Christ, and is a necessary part simply of the historical movement or process by which this is brought to take effect on the world.

Dr. Dorner charges me farther with overlooking the fact, that the Creed rests upon the Trinity and "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth;" while, according to my view, he says, it ought to proceed forth at once from Christ. But to this sufficient answer has already been made, in what I have said in my *Third Article* of the necessary central position of Christ in the scheme of Christianity, over against the notion of its being intelligible in any way from the idea of God outside the idea of Christ. The question, we have seen, regards the Manifestation of God in His relations to the world; and this, as it completes itself in Christianity, comes to its full effulgent focus in His Incarnate Son, who is the image of the invisible God, the reflected brightness or shining of the Father's glory and the exact copy or character of His person (*χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*). Looked at in this way, the revelation we have of God in Christ is not simply something added to what we may know of Him in other ways; it brings His whole being and character before us under an entirely new view. Thus it is, that the mystery of the Trinity comes out only through the mystery of the Incarnation; and a belief in God as the Maker of heaven and earth, is conditioned absolutely by our belief in Him as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Although the Creed then starts with God the Father Almighty, it is plainly in such a way that this article, as well as the whole fact of the Trinity, is apprehended and acknowledged only in and by the

light which is thrown back upon the Godhead from the Person of Christ. In other words, the organization of the Creed is strictly and exclusively Christocentric; and no one can repeat it understandingly, who does not take his position with true faith first of all in the great fact of the Incarnation, so as from this point of vision only, to take in the form and sense of all that goes before as well as of all that follows after.

VII. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CREED.

After what has now come into view in regard to Dr. Dorner's divergency from the Christological construction of the Apostles' Creed, and in consideration especially of its bearing upon the Church, and through this upon his theory of the material principle of Protestantism (where we reach the full profound significance of our present controversy), it seems proper to consider here somewhat more closely the general nature of this old œcumenical confession, on the authority and force of which so much depends for the whole discussion with which we are now engaged. This I cannot do more satisfactorily perhaps, in brief compass, than by using for the purpose an argument on the subject which I published in the *Messenger* not long since as one of my series of articles on the *Church Movement.*

The Creed is constructed on the assumption that Christianity is historical, and that in this form it begins wholly and entirely in Christ. He is not the teacher and revealer simply of its several articles; but the articles are all so many historical realities or facts, that flow forth with necessary derivation from His presence in the world, just like a stream from its fountain. Without Him they would have no truth or meaning whatever. He is in Himself first of all, the universal system of grace and truth which they serve to bring into view.

They mistake the character of the symbol altogether, then, who see in it a summary simply of supposed primary doctrines, each accepted as true on its own separate evidence, and all then joined together in a merely external way. So one, for example, might settle in his own mind on certain religious truths, such as the being of God, the immortality of the soul, the in-

spiration of the Scriptures, the fall of man, the miraculous birth of Christ, the atonement, justification by faith, the resurrection, the eternal damnation of the wicked; might hold these to be so many severally independent truths, all equally necessary to be believed as fundamental elements of the Christian system; and so putting them all together might call this his Creed, meaning to express by the term simply his notional conception of so many things as needed to be owned and confessed by a Christian man. But it is not in this way at all that the articles of the Creed challenge our belief; and those for whom the formulary is nothing more than such an outward platform of things to be separately believed, show plainly that they have not yet begun to understand properly "what be the first principles of the oracles of God," as they are here made to be the object of the Christian faith.

The articles of the Creed are true only in Christ, and not at all out of Christ. Any one of them taken separately from Him, and held for a truth independently of His person, would by that fact alone cease to be true in the sense of the Creed, even if it might have some truth of its own in another and different sense. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the future judgment, for example, made to be the object of belief in any other form than that which they have as dependent upon the mystery of the incarnation, would not be any part of what the Creed is in fact; could not be taken as entering at all into its constitution; but must be regarded as belonging to some other scheme of faith altogether. As the branches of a living tree are what they are only through their relation to the trunk and root from which they grow, and without this could not be true branches at all; so here the several articles of the Creed are but so many forms of existence, historical facts, that root themselves throughout in "Christ, the Son of the Living God" and to tear them away from this root is to destroy at once their whole life and force. They are severally different objects of faith; and yet they are collectively, at the same time, all one object of faith. They cause to pass before us, in panoramic vision, the universal ground scheme of the new creation;

while they show all revolving at the same time, in full-orbed glory, around the Son of Man who is also the Son of God. He is the centre, the alpha and omega, of the Christian Salvation. Not only the whole matter of the Creed, but the whole form of it also, is determined in this way by its derivation from Christ. Its articles are, objectively considered, the movement of the new creation itself *in Christ Jesus*, out to its glorious consummation at the last day; and through this self-unfolding movement they are not only what they are, but also where they are, in the Apostolical *regula fidei.*

Apprehended in the way now stated, the articles of the Creed become to our view at once *mysteries*, and as such true objects for faith in the proper sense of the term. So much lies in the very idea of the *Creed.* It has to do properly with mysteries, supposed to transcend the order of nature, and to be apprehensible as true, therefore, only through the exercise of faith. This at once serves to show, that no article of the Creed can be truly believed on the ground simply of its being ascertained to be true in some other way before it is believed. If one, for example, should have come to be convinced of the existence of God, or of a future life, by the light of reason, no such conviction would be enough to make these articles for Him what they are in the Creed, But more than this: the articles of the Creed are what they are here for faith, even as revealed truths, not through any separate revelation; but only by reason of their flowing forth from the original Mystery of Godliness, the Word made Flesh in the Person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They exist for faith, and are what they are, only in the bosom of the new world of grace which has been brought to pass by His incarnation, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glorification; so that on the outside of this new creation, they cannot be known or received as real and true in their own form by any intelligence whatever. Every article of the Creed is in this way, by virtue of its comprehension in the power of Christ's life, a mystery for faith, just as truly as the incarnation itself is such a mystery; and to be believed truly, it must be believed with an inward apprehension of the relation in which it thus stands to this fundamental mystery. In no other way, can any

article be believed at all; for every article is what it is here for faith, wholly and exclusively through its relation to the great fact that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh.

The Creed thus is for faith throughout; not for doctrinal apprehension immediately, or theological knowledge, but for faith. Faith is the special organ, and the only organ, for taking in the sense of its mysterious truths, or say rather, of its mysterious facts. And now, as such a power of taking in the sense of the Gospel in its own form, it must move in its exercise comformbly to the actual constitution of the Gospel as we have it exhibited in the Creed. In other words, it must follow the order of the Creed; beginning where this begins, and ending where it ends; so that Christianity, or the Gospel, shall be for it subjectively just what it is in the Creed objectively. As the organ for taking in Christianity, then, faith cannot start with the authority of the Scriptures, with the doctrine of justification, or any other like article; neither can it go to work laying hold of one truth here and another there, in a loose promiscuous way; it must start where Christianity itself starts, and follow the actual movement of Christianity throughout; so that the Gospel shall be found repeating itself, as it were, in the form of its believing apprehension. Only as thus answering to the actual nature of its object, can faith be at all true faith, in distinction from mere notion or fancy; and only thus can it have the force of an argument for the truth of its object, as being in the language of the New Testament, "the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen."

All Christian faith, thus, according to the Apostles' Creed, starts in the power of acknowledging that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (1 John iv. 1–3). This is not one among other articles simply, which are required for a good evangelical confession; it is the root of all other articles, and the assurance of it for faith draws after it the Divine certification of all that follows. The evidence on which faith accepts as true the following parts of the Creed, is found first of all in the self-authenticating mystery of the Saviour's glorious person, the fountain from which all its declaration of truth and grace proceeds. In

this way all the articles of the Creed have their proof ultimately in Christ, and carry with them for faith what may be called an *a priori* demonstration drawn from His actual presence in the world. Faith does not wait to have them made intelligible or certain from any other quarter, or under any other form; but is carried over to them at once, and finds itself as it were shut up to them, from the force of what is felt to be comprehended in the mystery of the incarnation itself. Not that the articles could be drawn out from this fundamental fact, without the help of history, by mere speculation; but in such sense, that the history coming after the fact is at once felt to be authenticated by it as its own necessary onward movement and course. In this way, the certainty of the whole Creed gathers itself up still into the primitive confession: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God!" There all true Christian faith begins. Its object is, first of all, the Incarnate Word, through the light of whose glorious appearing, then, all the following facts of the Gospel are made evident to it, and thus come to be apprehended by it as so many parts of the general mystery of godliness in their proper order.

Thus it is, that all through the Creed faith goes before intelligence, and postulates the truth of every article as a mystery in Christ, before it is comprehended or proved from any other quarter. Indeed there is no room for comprehension or proof, in the case, from any other quarter. As the whole Creed is true in fact only in and through Christ, so it is only in and through the apprehension of Christ that the truth of it can be apprehended really at any point. We believe in the resurrection of Christ, not because we can understand it, nor because we can prove it by any natural evidence; for how should the natural be able to evidence and prove that which is above itself, the supernatural? but because our faith in Christ Himself, as the Son of God, carries us irresistibly forward to the idea of such victory over death and him that had the power of death. In the same way we believe his descent into hades; not because we know where that unseen world is, or what exactly He accomplished while there; but because we feel that without this His

resurrection could not have carried with it the profound cosmical significance, which alone can make it credible in connection with His heaven-descended person.

In the same way, let us add again, we believe in His second advent ("He shall come to judge the quick and the dead"); not because we know when, or how, it is to take place; but as a mystery involved in his first advent, and necessary to complete the sense and purpose of all that goes before in His Mediatorial Life. It is part of the Christian faith, which cannot become dim for us without shedding dimness and shadow at the same time over the whole Creed.

And just so, as I have shown before, we believe the article of the Church and its necessary attributes. Not because we have been able in the first place to identify its existence under an outward empirical form; nor yet because of any power we have to construct a satisfactory scheme of it in a purely theoretical way; but because our faith in Christ and Christianity shuts us up to the idea of the Church, as the only form of religious life adequate for the manifestation of religion in such absolute view. This does not imply, that we are to content ourselves with a mere ideal conception of the Church; or that our faith does not require us to concern ourselves about its actual presence in the outward historical world. We know very well, that no invisible abstraction here can satisfy the sense of the Creed. The Church must be visible as well as invisible, to be the object of true Christian faith. All I mean is, that our faith in the Church must start forth from its ideal conception, to be of any account for its empirical apprehension. Only so can the Church Question be for us ever of any earnest practical interest. Our sects commonly feel easy on the subject, only because they do not *believe* in the Church; it is no object of preliminary faith for them at all, as it is made to be in the Creed. Faith here, as elsewhere, must go before knowledge. *They* reverse the order of faith entirely (as Philip also did in another respect, John xiv. 8, from his simply theocentric stand-point), who say: "Lord, *show* us the Church and it sufficeth us!"

Faith in the Church then, it can easily be seen, is not op-

posed, as some foolishly imagine, to faith in Christ. The Creed does not set the Church before Christ or above Him. On the contrary, it is from Him and for Him; as the body is complete only through the head, from which it draws all its vital energy and power. We do not believe in the Church first, and then in Christ; but because we believe in Christ, therefore we believe also in the Church; just as believing in Christ first, we believe also in the forgiveness of sins and in the resurrection of the body.

So much now for the general nature and constitution of the Apostles' Creed, the *rule of faith* which governed the universal Christian thinking of the early Church. It proceeds throughout on the assumption, that the Gospel starts in Christ, and sees in it everywhere but the unfolding of the grace and truth which were brought into the world originally in His person, through the mystery of His holy incarnation. In this view, it agrees in full with the primitive, New Testament idea of the Gospel, as it was preached by our Lord Himself in the days of His flesh; as we have it proclaimed in the Acts of the Apostles; as it pervades the universal Christology of St. John; and as it underlies the profound soteriology of St Paul. It is the expansion only of St. Peter's prototypal confession (on which the Church is built); and answers to the sense of what he saw on Mount Tabor, as we hear him quoting it in his old age (2 Pet. i. 16–17): "We have not followed cunningly devised fables (dreams, notions, speculations), when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty. For He received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came to Him such a voice from the excellent glory, This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount." It is the Mystery of Godliness spoken of, 1 Tim. iii. 16: "God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." All gathers itself up into the confession, that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; that Jesus is the Son of God; that God hath given to us eternal life, and that this life is

in His Son (1 John iv. 3–15; v. 11). He is the principle or fountain of the whole Christian revelation; and so our faith in it also to be real or saving at any other point, must begin first of all with His person. By Him only can we believe in God the Father; and only by Him can we believe in any doctrine or fact belonging to Christianity and the Gospel. Our power to believe in the Holy Ghost, in the Church, in the Bible, in the atonement, in justification by faith, and in all else necessary to be believed by a true Christian, is comprehended primarily in this, that we can say: I BELIEVE THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD.

VIII. POWERS OF THE WORLD TO COME.

I proceed next to the consideration of Dorner's criticism on the third distinction of our theology, which I have denominated in my *Vindication*, its "historical and objective character." This is closely connected with its relation to the Creed; for the whole conception of this symbol, as we have seen, turns upon the idea of a new order of objective existence, starting in Christ and perpetuating itself by the Church, through the power of His Spirit, in the most real historical way, to the end of time. In disowning the old doctrine of the Church, therefore, as we have it in the Creed, our German critic disowns necessarily at the same time, the idea of any supernatural constitution or order of grace permanently at hand in the world, in a form answerable to this doctrine. Here again, however, as before, he does not go into any close argument on the subject; but contents himself, mainly, with a somewhat dictatorial disposition of it, in the way of two or three more desultorily sweeping than soundly conclusive notes.

For example. I say in my tract, speaking of the necessary relation between the objective and the subjective in Christianity: "The order of all true supernatural teaching is, the objective first, and the subjective or experimental afterwards, as something brought to pass only by its means. Most of all, we may say, is this true of Christianity, the absolute end of all God's acts of revelation. Its whole significance is comprehended, first

of all, in the Divine deed, whereby God manifested Himself in the flesh through the mystery of the Incarnation. This objective act is itself the Gospel, in the profoundest sense of the term. In the very nature of the case, it must underlie and condition all that the Gospel can ever become for men in the way of inward experience. True, it cannot save men without their being brought to experience its power; on which account it is, that we need to be placed in communication with it through faith; but the power that saves, is not, for this reason, in our experience or faith; it is wholly in the object with which our faith is concerned." On this Dorner notes as follows:

"*Right; but the question remains: Where and how does this object exist? Has God so entered into the world, that He has no longer any transcendence, but only immanence? That would amount directly to something pantheistic, and thus heathenish, a binding of God to space and time. Or has Christ so incorporated Himself with the Church, that He has no longer any transcendence with regard to it, not even through the Holy Ghost, but the measure of the life and power of the Church simply is to be taken as the measure of His life and power. Then is He sunk (the Reformers said, buried,) in the Church; His pretended glory is abdication. It is to be asked then: Does Nevin regard the Church as the continuation of Christ, or does he leave Christ a place still aside from the Church? The difference between them must be destroyed, in proportion as only the communication of Christ's life is before all made to flow from Him, while the atonement and justification, in their independent significance, are overlooked.*"

Such argumentation, I must be allowed to say, is unworthy of so great a man as Professor Dorner. It means nothing, and proves nothing. It is easy to ask questions of this sort, that are purely hypothetical in their form; but it is just as easy to answer them, if need be, with counter-questions of the same problematical character. Certainly, I do not confound God with the world, nor Christ with the Church. On the contrary, I have taken all pains everywhere to guard against any such misconstruction of my views, But now, to turn the tables: Does

Dr. Dorner then so hold the Divine transcendence, as to place God mechanically on the outside of the world in the sense of Mohammedan Deism? Or does he make Christ so extrinsical to the Church, that it cannot be said to be His *Body* in any organic sense whatever? It is easy, I say, to ask such questions. But they prove nothing, and they illuminate nothing. It is not strange, perhaps, that in this country attempts should have been made heretofore, by a certain order of theologasters, to render the idea of Christ's continuous presence and working in the Church odious, by caricaturing it as a sort of physical prolongation of His proper personal life; but one may well be surprised to meet with anything, bordering even on such crudity, in the criticism of Dorner. He at least knows, that to make God in Christ the ground of all Christian life, is not necessarily to reduce Christianity in whole to a pantheistic identification with the being of Him from whom it thus flows. Christ in such view is not lost in His people; just as little as His people are lost by any spiritual annihilation in Him.

Again I say in my tract, speaking of the historical character of Christianity: "Not only the subjective religious experiences and opinions of men here are to be regarded as entering into the flow of history, like their political or scientific judgments, but the objective reality from which Christianity springs, the new order of existence which was constituted for the world by the great fact of the Incarnation, must be allowed also to be historical. Only in such view can we possibly retain our hold on the objectively supernatural, as it entered into the original constitution of the Gospel. It is not enough for this purpose, to have memories only of what was once such a real presence in the world. It lies in the very conception of the Gospel, in this objective view, that its supernatural economy should be of perennial force, that its resources and powers should be *once for all;* not in the sense of something concluded and left behind, as many seem to imagine, but in the sense of what, having once entered into the life of the world, has become so incorporated with it as to be part of its historical being to the end of time."

On this we have another indefinite note: "*Certainly Chris-*

tianity must exist always as a historical power; that Nevin's adversaries also must demand. The only question is: Has it such enduring existence in this, that word and sacraments can never fail and that believers can never die out upon the earth, in whom union with the Spirit of Christ is perpetuated, but who cannot still be outwardly and visibly distinguished in the present seculum; or is this union bound securely to an order (priests), and does it propagate itself surely everywhere through sacramental acts of the priests? The last, inasmuch as faith is not to be had by a charm, can be affirmed only where no weight is laid upon faith, that is, where recourse is had with Catholic bias to the magical opus operatum."

This, it seems to me, is little better than begging the whole question, by throwing it into the form of an alternative, which I can see no necessity for admitting whatever. Still less am I able to see, how it invalidates in the least what I say, in the passage just quoted, on the necessity of a historical substantive existence of Christianity in its general character, as something different altogether from the successive multitudinous experiences simply of individual believers. These stand in the "powers of the world to come;" but they are not for this reason, in and of themselves, the very substance and whole presence of those powers.

And now just here let me ask what rational conception can we have of these *powers of the world to come* (Heb. vi. 6), if they are not to be regarded as the continuous presence, in some way, of the supernatural forces of Christianity in the bosom of the world's ordinary natural life? Christians are said to have tasted the word of God, and the powers of the world to come (*δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*); as having come thus into communication with an order of existence higher than that of the world around them; the "age to come" in distinction from the "present age"—or, as St. Paul calls it, Gal. i. 4, "this present evil world (*ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ*)," to deliver us from which Christ gave Himself for our sins, according to the will of God and our Father. The "world to come" in such view, we see at once, is not any order of existence simply which

may be supposed to await us beyond the grave; and still less can it be regarded as a system of religious thought and feeling merely, having to do with things supernatural and eternal. It can be nothing less, plainly, than the actual presence here on earth, in the most real way, of that higher stadium of existence for man, in which, according to all the Old Testament promises of God, the miseries of his first fallen state were to come to an end finally in the glories of a new spiritual creation, to be ushered in through the advent of the Messiah. All this involves the idea of an economy, different from the old economy of the first merely natural *seculum*, having in its bosom objective forces answerable to its own constitution (the *powers* of the world to come), and subsisting in such form historically through the ages. All this in and through Christ; who in such view is broadly distinguished from Moses, and all the angelic ministries of the Old Testament, as being the principle of "so great salvation (*τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας*)." "For unto the angels," it is solemnly said Heb. ii. 5, "has He not put in subjection the *world to come* (*τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν*) whereof we speak."

Have we not the analogy of this everywhere in our natural world-life? The deepest forces of history, all the world over, lie not in the doings of single men separately considered, but in the general moral existence in which they and all their doings are comprehended; and this general moral existence, let it be well considered, is something far more always than an abstraction or mere figure of speech. It is just as much positive substance, to say the least, as the flesh and blood, or as the soul and mind, of the several personages that figure on the field of history in an outward concrete way. The invisible here again, as in the case of all organized being, is older, deeper, wider, more lasting, and more potent altogether, than the visible. What is it for example, that the history of a nation has to do with mainly, in order to be in full worthy of its name? Not with the details of individual life certainly so much as with the onward movement of the national life in its universal view, the inward ethical substance (embodied in customs, laws, institutions, past memories of every sort, and continually occurring new deeds),

which underlies and actuates unceasingly its whole empirical presence in the world. The proper being of the nation, regarded in this way, is not open to the observation of sense; you cannot lay your hand upon it as a palpable entity in the midst of other palpable things. But for all this, it is none the less actual, and none the less continually at work, and making itself powerfully felt everywhere, in the drama of the nation's existence. In this way it is a world of unseen powers, which in their own order and sphere are just as objectively real and abiding, as the hills and vallies that surround us in the world of nature. What we call the spirit of a people, or the genius of an age, is nothing more nor less in fact, than just such an objective historical force; which is all the time active in the affairs of men; which enters on all sides into doctrines, usages, and laws; which settles itself in institutions, incorporates itself with learning and science, enshrines itself in creations of art, and reveals its presence sacramentally through all manner of mystic signs and symbols; which has its own ministries, and sets men apart also to fulfill them, arming them with all needful powers for the purpose. An objective historical force thus of the most real and substantial order, which no one surely can refuse to acknowledge without damage and reproach to his own reason.

And why now should it be held incredible, that the counterpart of all this should have place, under a far higher form, in the *Civitas Dei*, the Christian Church, the glorious Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? If there be room to speak of a substantive historical existence as belonging to the general life and spirit of a people in the order of nature, why should we feel it necessary to ascribe less reality, instead of ascribing immeasurably more, to the common ground of Christianity, as this holds in the ever active agency and power of the Spirit of Christ by which He is present in His Church to the end of time?

Dorner resolves the perpetuity of the Church into this simply, that word and sacraments fail not and believers never die out wholly on the earth. But what now does he mean by word and sacraments? Are they outward forms only; or do they take

hold on inward spiritual realities? And are these realities, then, of no standing objective force, but occasional influences only from God, made to attend the outward forms in a mechanical, more or less magical way? What is the perpetuity of word and sacraments, if there be no constant, perpetual substance behind them which they serve to certify and bring into view? How are word and sacraments themselves to be certified, and shown to be authentical and true in distinction from all spurious counterfeits, if not through the actual presence in them of objective forces (powers of the world to come) which in their own sphere are as perpetual as Christ himself? "The words that I speak unto you," our Saviour says, "they are *spirit* and they are *life*." "We believe and are sure," responded the Apostles, "that Thou hast *words of eternal life*." (John vi. 63, 68.) And so with the sacraments. Baptism, according to St. Peter, carries in it the power of salvation (1 Peter iii. 21); and the Lord's Supper is the communion of the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. x. 16). They are of such force, not because they originate these things of themselves (which would be magic), but because they find them positively at hand in the world of grace, and signify and seal the presence of them to true believers. What are the sacraments as *signs*, and above all, what are they as *seals*, if what they perpetuate comes only of themselves, and has no abiding objective existence beyond themselves; if they *signify* no actual existence, but a thought only in our minds; if they *seal* not, and so touch not in the way of actual verification, any substance of grace behind their own phenomenal forms. As in the secular world political emblems and guaranties (national flags or national bonds, for example) mean nothing, and are worth nothing, without the actual political resources which exist altogether independently of them in real historical form; so it ought to be plain, that in the world of grace also sacramental signs and pledges can be of no account, except as they serve to set us in communion with the positive actualities of that world, existing before and beyond all such certification. This world of grace (its resources and powers derived from Christ, and perennially subsistent in the

Spirit of Christ) is the true idea of the Holy Catholic Church, which is made to be for us an article of faith in the Creed; where, moreover, it comes *before* the sacraments (as indicated by the position of the "forgiveness of sins," or the Nicene "one baptism for the remission of sins"), and not *after* them as required by the view of Dr. Dorner. How, indeed, can I believe in sacraments, and through them come to be sure of the Church, if I have no faith first in the being of the Church itself, from which the sacraments derive all their significance and force?

We find Dr. Dorner here, then, in the same wrong predicament, virtually, in which we have found him before. He does not carry out his Christological thinking in the order of the Apostles' Creed; and the consequence is, that the Church is for him no such object of faith as it is made to be in that ancient œcumenical symbol, but another and very different conception altogether, answering to what he holds to be the necessary conditions of its existence in the modern Protestant world. To this it comes at last, with his confessed *divergency* from what he calls the old Greek or Oriental Christology. He will hear of no "Church intervention" in the economy of the Gospel, no coming in of any Church-embosomed powers of grace between Christ and the believer, but only of what he denominates the "means of grace;" which then, of course, must be taken as abstract and independent agencies, outside of any such supposed Divine constitution. "*The means of grace*," he tells us plumply, (in one of his sweeping foot-notes again), "*are not the Church; only believers are so, who gather themselves around the means of grace. We cannot say, therefore, that salvation is of the Church, or that the Church mediates between God and His people. God's people are the Church; they stand in direct communication with Christ, although through the means of grace.*"

There we have it in a nutshell. The Church, an external aggregation of believers simply, joining in the use mechanically of certain instrumental helps to their piety, which are in no sense themselves part of its proper heavenly economy, and in no sense, therefore, part of what St. Paul makes the Gospel to be, when he speaks of it as "the wisdom of God and the power of

God unto salvation." The means of grace certainly are not the Church, in and of themselves; but what can they possibly amount to without the Church, regarded as the comprehension of all the saving powers of Christianity, kept up by the Holy Ghost, through the living fellowship of believers, with true objective historical existence (powers of the word and ministry, sacramental and liturgical powers, in one word, all the powers of the new creation in Christ Jesus), age after age, according to His own promise, to the end of the world! Can any view less large than this be found answerable at all to the light in which the Church is exhibited to us by St. Paul as the Body of Christ, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all? Take in particular the magnificent picture we have of it in Eph. iv. 8–16. "When he ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that He ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. And He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers. For the perfecting of the saints; for the work of the ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ. From whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

If that be not the idea of the Church, in the character of an objectively historical, sacramental, and Divine constitution, as we have it in the Creed, it would be hard to say how it could well be set forth in more clear and commanding terms.

IX. FUNDAMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INCARNATION.

It argues, to my mind, a profound defect in Professor Dorner's theology, that he should imagine the cardinal importance of the *Atonement* to be wronged, by its being made to fall back upon the ulterior fact of the *Incarnation* as its origin and ground.

Over and over again, we find him touching, with incidental remark, on this chord, as though there could be no uncertainty whatever in its evangelical sound. "Nevin's theology," he says, "places in the centre the incarnation and life of Christ, not His death and sacrifice"—as if to do that, were a self-evident Christian blunder. "The distinction between Christ and His Church is made to vanish," we are told, "in proportion as all stress is laid on the communication of His life, and the *independent significance* (selbständige Bedeutung) of the atonement and justification is overlooked." With the Greek Church, he says, I "place main emphasis only on the incarnation." My view of the Church, to his mind, obscures the distinct force of the atonement, "because it dwells almost entirely on the mystical communication of Christ's life, but has little to say of justification, merging this rather in sanctification."

I have had occasion to meet this charge, not long since, in my reply to Dr. Ruetenik's very respectable article on the Church Movement, published in the *Reformirte Wächter;* but the regular course of the present discussion requires that the subject should here again also receive some formal consideration. It is altogether too important to be passed over in my answer to Professor Dorner. I must at least recapitulate, in a general way, what I have said before.

The Incarnation before the Atonement.

It seems a mere truism to say, that the sufferings and death of Christ follow in *time* His birth of the Virgin Mary. Without the manger, there could be no cross. The Saviour must come into the world, before He could die in the world. Christmas is older forever, in the order of the Church Year, than Good Friday or Easter.

More than this mere chronological priority, however; it is no less plain that the incarnation carries in it the antecedent necessary *conditions* of the atonement. In the birth of Christ, first of all, lay the whole possibility of His vicarious satisfaction for the sins of men by His death upon the cross; because through it alone was brought to pass that wonderful constitution of His Person, by which only He was qualified to be a true Mediator between God and man in any part of His Mediatorial office and work. So the Heidelberg Catechism has it: "He must be a true and sinless man; because the justice of God requires, that the same human nature which has sinned should make satisfaction for sin—but no man being himself a sinner, could satisfy for others" (Ques. 16). And then again: "He must be at the same time true God; that by the power of His Godhead, He might bear, in His Manhood, the burden of God's wrath, and so obtain for, and restore to us righteousness and life" (Ques. 17). No angel could bear such office; but only the Son of God made to be, at the same time, the Son of Man. And therefore it is, that in the economy of redemption the life of Christ goes before His death, not only in the order of time, but in the order also of inward power and force. The mystery of the Incarnation includes in itself potentially, and in due course of time puts forth from itself actually, the mystery of the Atonement.

In this view, then, I go on to say still farther, the Incarnation is in itself of original and primary significance for the purposes of our salvation; in such sense, that the historical movement of the world's redemption must be regarded as starting in it, and having in it its necessary organic principle and source. In other words, it is not to be viewed as a mere outward device for making the Atonement possible. To this degrading conception of Christ, must come in the end all that way of magnifying His death, by which His life is made to be with regard to it of only secondary and more or less dependent account. The view is common among modern unchurchly and so-called evangelical sects; which indeed arrogate to themselves this title *evangelical*, for the most part, just because they lay all stress on the atonement taken in such miserably abstract sense. The whole

Gospel is thus shorn of its proper historical force; and the result is, on all sides, a certain amount of unrealness and Gnostic spiritualism, which is sure to prove itself unfriendly always to true and vigorous faith.

But, it may be asked, must not the end rule the beginning here, as in the case of all true teleology in God's works? I answer, Yes; but it is only the whole, last end which can do this properly, and not any intermediate partial end; and then, at the same time, the wholeness of the end will ever be found to be but the proper fullness of the beginning, showing this to have been, in truth, the principle throughout of the universal process. Here precisely is the fallacy and falsehood of the view I am now opposing, that it resolves the whole Gospel into the atonement, and makes the death of Christ to be the ultimate and only end of His coming into the world; whereas it is in fact but a part of what was to be accomplished by this great mystery of godliness (1 Tim. iii. 16), and itself also an organic means only toward a far wider teleology embraced in the mystery from the beginning. The view before us narrows the meaning of Christ's Mediatorial Person to His priestly office only; but His Person from the beginning is no less the principle also of His prophetical and kingly offices. His coming in the flesh looks to His death; but not so as to pause in that by any means as its final object; on the contrary, so only as *through* this to reach forward to His subsequent resurrection and glorification, with all their triumphant consequences, out to the full end, "when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." In this broad teleology, indeed, we *do* find the original sense of the Christian principle, *God manifest in the flesh.* But here only. The restriction of it to any narrower purpose and scope is sure to do deep wrong to the Gospel; and it must ever be, therefore, a serious prostitution of the term Evangelical, when it is applied to any such mutilated mode of Christian thought.

The Gospel in Christ Himself.

The Gospel was in the world before Christ died. It was preached to the shepherds near Bethlehem on the night of His

birth; when "the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them," filling them with amazement and dread. "Fear not," it was said unto them, "for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." It was proclaimed at His baptism, when the Holy Ghost came down upon Him in visible form, and a voice was heard from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." He was Himself, among men, the fullness of the Godhead bodily. All the powers of the Gospel were actually at hand in His Person. Christianity is a new creation; not a great revolution or change simply in the order of the world as it stood before, but the bringing into it of a new supernatural life; and this new life starts unquestionably in Christ. He is thus the principle of the new creation, the alpha and omega of all it is found to comprehend; and so the consciousness or sense of what He is in this respect must ever be the root and ground of all true Christian faith in any farther view.

What less than this, I ask in the first place, is to be made of all those passages, in which the Pre-existent Word is spoken of or referred to as being the source and fountain of the universal creation; in such a way, at the same time, that all is regarded as being one grand system, whose full and last sense is reached only in the economy of redemption? In the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, it is said of the Divine Logos, by whom all things were made, that "in him was Life;" and this life, it is added, "was the light of men." The universal world of mind, in other words, as we have it in man, was derived from Him as its self-existent ground; in such sort, that even after the fall, He continued to actuate its inmost being as "light shining in darkness," though the darkness comprehended it not. Then, in the fullness of time, "the Word was made flesh," we are told, became fully joined with the life of humanity in an actual historical way, for the purposes of its redemption; and dwelt among us, as the complete embodiment of God's presence and glory in the world, full of grace and truth. This manifestation is itself,

plainly, what St. John holds to be the fundamental fact of the Gospel, which "came by Jesus Christ;" in distinction from the law, that was "given by Moses." In like manner, St. Paul (Col. i. 15-19) declares Christ to be the first-born of the natural creation; that is, the fountain-head of "all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible;" and then goes on to speak of Him as the Head also of the Church, "the beginning, the first-born from the dead;" clearly making Him to be, as the Word Incarnate, the root and origin of the entire new creation, no less fully than He is to be considered as being, before He became man, the producing cause of the old creation. With all this agree His own words on the isle of Patmos (Rev. 1; 11, 17, 18): "I am alpha and omega, the first and the last: I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hades and of death."

Look now, in the next place, at the historical Gospel, as it meets us first of all in the life and ministry of our blessed Lord Himself. What can be plainer, for all simple-minded readers of the Holy Evangelists, than that the presence of Christ is to be regarded as having been itself the presence of the Christian Salvation among men during the days of His flesh? John the Baptist preached the immediate coming of the kingdom of heaven; but in Christ, this kingdom was actually at hand, and men were called upon to submit at once to its authority and power. And what now was to be the object of their believing trust, the principle or starting point of the Christian life in them, so far as they might be engaged to obey the call. Not certainly the cross and passion of Christ, which were still a mystery that even the faith of Apostles was not prepared to receive; nor yet, we will add, any word or work of Christ outwardly and separately considered. Christian discipleship did not stand in acknowledging (with Nicodemus) the truth of Christ's miracles, nor in admiring His doctrine, as many did who heard His sermon on the mount. Miracle and doctrine became of account in the case, only as they served to fasten attention on the Saviour Himself, and caused it to be felt that He was of a truth in His

own person more than all His teaching or working under any other view. The significance of His teaching and working lay throughout in the life, from which they proceeded, and which they served to reveal. In this sense, most emphatically, Christ was Himself the Gospel, before He died and rose again from the dead. All the powers of the Gospel, together with all its treasures of wisdom and knowledge, were hid in His person from the beginning. And therefore was He, in the days of His flesh, directly and immediately, the one grand central object of Christian faith; which then had its "perfect work" in simply embracing His presence, and cleaving to it, as the sum of all truth and righteousness, without reference to any following doctrine or fact whatever. This was the form in which Christianity began in the world; the form in which it was originally preached by the Master Himself. Who will say that the preaching was not *evangelical*, because it did not start with the atonement, but made the mystery of the incarnation exhibited in the living Christ to be the fundamental principle and beginning of the whole Christian salvation?

The simplest form of the Gospel, as thus preached by Christ, is: FOLLOW ME! Again we have it in the words: "Come unto *Me* all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." All turns upon seeing and feeling that Christ is more for the soul than the whole world besides, as He claims to be in every such command or invitation. This does not depend necessarily at all on knowing *how* He is the Saviour of the world, or on being assured that He is so by an evidence or argument from beyond Himself. On the contrary, it is and must be always, first of all, the result of a power that is felt to proceed directly from the person of the Saviour Himself; a power that draws the soul towards Him, and binds it more and more to Him, with the intuitional conviction that He is its only proper life and its absolutely supreme good. This was the only kind of faith He required of His first disciples; unbounded confidence in Himself; willingness to forsake all, at His word and in His service.

So in that memorable confession, Matth. xvi. 15-18; when to

our Lord's question, *Whom say ye that I am?* Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." We see at once, that it involved no doctrinal apprehension of the plan of salvation; and also that it was the result of no outward testimony or argument. It was an assurance that came wholly from the presence of Christ Himself, and which found in Him again, therefore, its sole object as an act of faith. Shall we imagine that for this reason it was defective, as not centering in the atonement? But how can we do that, in face of the judgment pronounced upon it, by our Lord Himself: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It is impossible to evade the force of this Divine attestation. Peter's confession is the exercise of Christian faith in its most fundamental character and form. It is God-wrought for the soul in which it is found; and it is the very rock on which the Church is built, and on which it rests immovably through all time.

I cannot pretend, however, to follow out at large this course of argument. It would require me to go over the whole Evangelical History; which, for this very reason, is called the *Gospel*, because it sets before us in graphic representation the person and life of Him, in whom originally were comprehended all the powers of the Christian salvation. In a profound sense, His own ministry, in the days of His flesh, had for its object the drawing of men simply to Himself. All His teaching and working looked this way; showing forth the grace and truth which were in Him, and offering His own glorious presence to the world as the fulfilment of its greatest need. Thus it was that He "went about all the cities and villages," we are told, "teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness, and every disease, among the people" (Math. ix. 35).

The Gospel of St. John, in particular, which has been denominated the *Heart of Christ*, is constructed throughout on the

principle of bringing into view the interior power and glory of the Redeemer, as being in Himself, in this way, the revelation of a new and higher order of life in the world. What it has to do with continually is the self-manifestation of this life, as it shone forth through all His works, and proclaimed itself in His words, showing Him to be the inmost law of the world's existence, and a force deeper than all other forces in the movement of its history. Here most emphatically, Christ is himself the Incarnate Gospel from the beginning. St. John's Christology everywhere, is full against all who seek to rob the Incarnation of its proper primary significance in the economy of redemption. No one was ever more ready to ascribe glory and dominion "unto Him that loved us and *washed us from our sins in His own blood*" (Rev. i. 5); and yet, as he tells us himself (John xx. 31), his Gospel was written expressly for this purpose: "That ye might believe, that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*"—Peter's fundamental confession, the germ of the Apostles' Creed —"and that believing ye might have life in His name."

The Post-Resurrection Gospel.

The Mediatorship of Christ involved the necessity of His atoning death. Without this the Gospel, previously comprehended in His life could not be complete. Still the death of Christ is not, for this reason, the beginning or end of the Gospel; and is not to be taken for the centre of it, in such sense that all going before or following after must be regarded as standing toward it in subordinate or mere ancillary relation. On the contrary, it comes in as itself subordinate to the victory with which we find it followed in His glorious resurrection; while this is brought into view always at the same time, not as the fruit of His death in any way (this being only its occasion), but as the fruit altogether of His previous theanthropic life, through the power of which He is alive for evermore, and holds in His hands the keys of death and hades.

In the Acts of the Apostles this comes into view continually. The preaching that first brought men by hundreds and thousands into the Church, as we have it represented here, is based

throughout on the fact of Christ's death; but in such a way always as to make this the medium only of proclaming His personal power and glory as displayed in the fact of His resurrection. The key-note of the Gospel is still everywhere, "Christ declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." We hear but little of the atonement directly; it is taken up into the glorious exaltation of the Redeemer at the right hand of God. The Apostles went forth as "witnesses" simply for Christ; and the burden of their testimony was always, not so much His death, as what had come after His death. The Gospel was still the all-powerful life of Him, who had become man for us men and for our salvation. "With great power," we are told, "gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus;" and God added to the Church daily such as should be saved. "The God of our fathers," they say to the Jewish Sanhedrim, "raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins; and we are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Philip preached Jesus unto the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 35–38), and baptized him on his confession: *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* Saul of Tarsus (Acts ix. 17–20,) was converted through the appearing of the risen Saviour unto him on his way to Damascus; and straightway, it is said, "he preached Christ in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God." That was for him, now, as it had been for the other Apostles before, the fundamental fact of the Gospel, the central object of the Christian faith. In Acts x. 34–43, we have this faith solemnly evangelized by St. Peter for the Gentile world, in these terms: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with Him. And we are witnesses of all things which He did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day,

and shewed Him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." In the same strain, precisely, we find the Gospel preached everywhere afterwards by St. Paul. Christ had been slain by the Jews; but this only made room for the manifestation of His glory. "God raised Him from the dead (Acts xiii. 28--33); and He was seen many days of them which came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are His witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son this day have I begotten Thee." So throughout. It is continually the same theme, "Jesus and the resurrection"—the personal Christ, once crucified and slain; but now powerfully demonstrated to be the Son of God by the evidences of His risen and glorified life.

The Gospel According to St. Paul.

What has just been said of St. Paul's preaching is the more observable, as he is generally taken to be the great authority (particularly in his Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians), for that view of the Gospel, which makes the Atonement the ground principle of Christianity, and the death of Christ the whole object of His coming into the world.

But the character of his actual preaching, as we have it recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, shows this judgment at once to be erroneous and false. He stands in no such contradiction with Himself. He does, indeed, make supreme account of the Saviour's atoning death; but only as it is comprehended always in the bosom of the Saviour's *Risen Life*—only as it grows forth always from the constitution of His Mediatorial

Person, and is comprised in the general "working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself." There is no material difference here between the teaching of St. Paul and the teaching of St. John. Both intone with full emphasis what Christ has accomplished for us by His death; but both are no less full and strong, in setting forth the still more fundamental significance of what He is for us in virtue of His imperishable and all-conquering life.

Who is it but St. Paul, for example, that opens before us the profound cosmical meaning of Christ's person in Rom. vii. 19--23; where the whole creation is represented as having a mysterious interest in the ultimate manifestation of His redemption? Who is it but St. Paul, that describes Him, Col. i. 14--20, as being at once the principle of the old creation and the principle of the new creation, "*in whom* we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins?" Who is it but St. Paul, that makes Him to be, Eph. i. 10, the final recapitulation or "gathering into one of all things, both which are in heaven and which are on earth?"

Who is it but St. Paul, we ask again, that urges with so much force, in 1 Cor. xv. 44–49 and elsewhere, that organic view of Christianity, which underlies the true idea of the Church, and which is always therefore more or less distasteful to the unchurchly spirit? In this view, of course, Christ becomes at once for faith the root of all Christianity, and the fountain of the universal Christian life out to the resurrection of the last day. He is the SECOND ADAM. That of itself gives us the whole thought, and causes us to feel the vital character of the relation that holds between Him and His people. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" the radical law of existence is the same in both cases. "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." Hence the familiar image, by which Christ is made to be the Head of the Church, while it is spoken of as His body, governed by His Spirit, and dependent on Him for its whole life. "He is the Head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead;

that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of the cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven" (Col. i. 18--20). How plainly the idea of the atonement here (the *blood of the cross*) is exhibited, not as the beginning of the new creation, but as a necessary all-glorious mode or condition only of its process—the process itself starting in the mystery of our Saviour's holy incarnation. The Church is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. (Eph. i. 23); and from Him, as the Head, "the whole body fitly joined by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying if itself in love" (Eph. iv. 16).

It is only carrying out the sense of this organic conception of Christianity, then, when the same St. Paul, who makes so much of the article of justification by faith, is found insisting again, in so many places, on the mystical union between believers and Christ; in a way that makes Him to be the actual life-principle of their new Christian being, and shows their life to be mysteriously involved in His from its commencement to its close. The regeneration in which all starts, and the resurrection in which all becomes at last complete, are substantially one and the same process; which is viewed, also, at the same time, as proceeding throughout from the glorified life of the Saviour Himself. The process is, of course, in its central character, ethical and free, and, in this form, answerable to the personal nature of its subjects; but is, at the same time, comprehended in the power of a law which is broader and deeper than itself, "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" and it is made to embrace in the end, the physical, no less than the spiritual side of our general human existence. It is a new creation, which, as such, cannot start from those who are the subjects of it, but must come from the fundamental regeneration of humanity that is brought to pass, first of all, in the Word made flesh (John iii. 6); while then it must reach out to the renovation of the entire man, ending in the "redemption of our

body" (Rom. viii. 23. All this, we say, is made to confront us in full in the Epistles of St. Paul; so that only the most perverse preconception or obtuse inattention can fail to see and acknowledge it. It conditions his view of Christian Baptism, and pervades his doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It enters into all his evangelical exhortations and instructions. It is no mere figure of speech with him, to identify the life of believers with the life of Christ. Dynamically considered, it is all one process; according to His own word: "Because I live, ye shall live also." His death, resurrection and glorification, are potentially (or as the end is in its principle) all this for His people also; who are in Him by faith, and are thus made, even while yet here in the body, to sit with Him in heavenly places (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανιοίς εν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Eph. ii. 1–6).

A mystery, which after all is only in effect what our Lord Himself proclaims, where He says (John v. 24): "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

This may answer to show how far St. Paul was from holding that abstract view of redemption, which is sometimes attributed to him, by those who seek to place him here in a sort of opposition to St. John. The New Testament, in regard to this whole subject, is fully at one with itself. It makes the death of Christ the necessary medium of our salvation; since we cannot be saved at all, as sinners, without being set free first of all from the condemning and binding power of sin; and this deliverance we can have only through the atoning efficacy of the Redeemer's blood apprehended by faith. But the atonement itself, in this view, is not an abstraction; it is immanent, or as we may say, resident throughout, in the person of Christ, and derives all its force thus continually from the power of His indestructible life. And so, then, the apprehension of it must ever be also an apprehension of it as embosomed and comprehended in this personal being of the Saviour. Such is the necessary order of the Christian faith. Christ first; and then His benefits. The Atonement IN the Incarnation; which is

thus seen to be the root and principle of the whole Christian redemption.

X. ŒCUMENICAL OR WHOLE CHRISTIANITY.

It seems a strange thing that our theology should be charged with making too much of Christ; when at other times it is represented as being unevangelical, for making too much of the Church. In the end, however, all really sound Church feeling is at the same time true Christological feeling. It springs from the apprehension of what is comprehended in the living fact of the Incarnation, regarded as the fountain-head of the whole Christian redemption. This must of course influence the view that is taken of Christ's sufferings and death, as well as of all His Mediatorial work in every other view. But why should it be held to stand in any opposition to the significance of this or any other part of that work? Why should any one imagine that to magnify the Incarnation, is not to magnify, at the same time, the Atonement; or that the honor of the Atonement is prejudiced somehow, by the putting of honor on the Incarnation, through which only the Atonement is brought to pass? No such false abstraction, we have now seen, finds any sort of countenance in the New Testament. We have reason to look upon it with distrust, therefore, wherever we meet it in actual ecclesiastical life. All that *Evangelicalism* (be it of the American or be it of the materially different German hue and shape), which affects to measure its zeal for Christ, by making low account of His life in order to make high account of His death, comes before us, to say the least, with questionable character; even if it should not be felt to carry on its front at once, by this very fact, the broad seal of its own condemnation.

Is it not surprising that such a man as Professor Dorner, instead of looking at the matter in this way, should reverse so plain a rule of judgment, and make it a presumption against our theology, that it lays great stress on the life of Christ (as though of itself *that* argued some undervaluation of his death); while the opposite system among us is accredited with him, on its own word simply, as being true to the whole sense of Christ's

coming in the flesh, just because it is heard uttering what he takes to be no uncertain sound in regard to the sense of His dying upon the cross? Surely he ought to know, that if there be a possibility of intoning too strongly here the ever living personality of the Redeemer, there is a possibility no less perilous on the other side, of so insisting on His finished sacrifice as to turn it into a mere Gnostic abstraction.

What right has Dorner to assume at all, as he seems to do everywhere, that my intonation of the life-powers of Christianity (resident perennially in the great fact of the Incarnation) is one-sided; that it argues any want of regard for the cardinal interest of the Atonement; or that there is no call for it in the actual circumstances of our American Christianity?

What right has he to assume that our American evangelical sect-system in general is not in the way here of setting up an abstract spiritualism, like the Gnostics of old and the Anabaptists of a later day, against the claims of the true concrete historical Christ, just because the system itself is forever harping nevertheless, on its own great zeal in preaching Christ; as if that were not possible in any false way?

On what I say, in my *Vindication*, concerning this boast of our unchurchly sects, that they preach Christ above all others, Dr. Dorner, for example, sitting away off in Berlin—as if the boast must needs pass for all it pretends—lets off one of his characteristic notes again in the following style:

"*This description of the other side is of crying injustice, especially in what regards the accentuation of objective Christian facts and truths. Their doctrine is indeed not the actual substance, Christ Himself, but only its image or representation; even Nevin himself, however, does not get beyond that. On the other hand, they lay more emphasis than he does on Christ's crucifixion. He on the contray emphasizes mainly, with the Geek Church, only the Incarnation.*"

The amount of this censure is, that all charge of a Gnosticizing spiritualistic tendency brought against any of our sects, must be taken for "crying injustice," as long as it is allowed at the same time, that they preach Christ in their way, and lay emphasis on the sin-abolishing power of His death; while on the other

hand, *my* laying emphasis on the Incarnation (with the Primitive Greek Church and the Œcumenical Creeds) must be regarded as *prima facie* evidence of a disposition to make little or no account of the Atonement, if not of absolute disaffection to the whole idea of justification by faith!

It is sufficiently plain, that when Dr. Dorner talks in this way, he is talking at random of things here in our American world, which he does not properly understand; and that he is himself, therefore, guilty of most serious "injustice," in allowing himself to dispose of them with such summary judgment.

Here, of course, our new Liturgy is held also to be at fault. It is very emphatic on the incarnation and the saving power of Christ's life; and that is taken to be of itself, in some way, depreciatory of the proper claims of the atonement. There is not in the Liturgy really, however, any overlooking at all of the cardinal significance of Christ's sufferings and death. On the contrary, the thought comes everywhere into view. The spirit of the Liturgy is baptized in it, bathed in it one may say, from beginning to end. This I have shown abundantly with regard to the service of the Holy Communion in particular, in my article on the subject against the *Reformirte Wächter;* to which let it be sufficient here to refer the attention of my readers. As in that article, so now here again, I deny utterly the charge that the Liturgy obscures or throws into the shade, in any way, the sacrificial side of the Gospel. On the contrary, it magnifies the significance of Christ's death, by showing it forth continually in right relation to His life, both as going before and as following after. It revolves everywhere around Christ, and Him crucified. On what other ground is it, indeed, that its enemies cavil against it as an *Altar* Liturgy, and resent what they stigmatize as its *Sacerdotal* character and tone? The conception of an altar, involves of itself the idea of sacrifice and propitiation. It is the *Pulpit* Liturgy only, in truth, which is by its very nature at once unsacrificial and unsacramental.

Were the Liturgy, it may be asked still farther, so out of cordial sympathy, as Dr. Dorner seems to imagine, with the cardinal significance of Christ's death, how is it to be accounted for that it moves so freely in the bosom of the old biblical and

ecclesiastical forms, which have been employed by the Church through all ages, to set forth this great mystery? It never tires in repeating the ancient *Creeds*. It loves the *Liturgy*. It takes pleasure in the *Gloria Patri*, the *Seraphic Hymn*, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*. It sings triumphantly the *Te Deum Laudamus*, and has special chants for the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus*. It moves through the cycle of the Christian year, with services that look continually either forward or backward, to *Good Friday* and *Easter*. In all this, no Pulpit worship is at all like it. What are we to make then of this characteristic harmony and concord with these ancient forms? Are they also open to censure here, in the same view with our Liturgy? Shall we say of the Creeds, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Litany, and the Ambrosian Hymn, that *they* too lay stress on the Incarnation at the expense of the Atonement, and fail to do justice to the significance of the Saviour's death, by magnifying unduly the boundless meaning of His life?

It would seem to require some considerable courage to do that. But Dr. Dorner does not shrink from so bold a judgment. It is some comfort, I confess, to find myself involved in common censure here with the Ancient Creeds, and with the theology in general of the Primitive Christian Church. That is what he means, by charging me with the old Oriental or Greek way of looking at Christianity. His divergency from me, Christologically, is a confessed divergency, at the same time, from the Greek Fathers generally, and as we have already seen, a very palpable divergency also from all the Œcumenical Creeds.

But in all this, I must respectfully believe that Dr. Dorner is wrong. If there was a reason in the age of the Reformation for so insisting on the ideas of atonement and justification by faith, as to leave out of sight for the time, comparatively, other interests embraced in the original Christology of the Gospel, it does not follow either that the original Christology was wrong, or that the specific partial use which was made of it in the age of the Reformation may not have been so carried out, as to involve serious perils for the Christian faith, requiring now an earnest resumption of those other interests for its present safety,

as well as for its proper wholeness and perfection in time to come. It is not to be denied, that the side of Christianity which has to do simply with Christ's atoning righteousness, *may* be so urged, in abstraction from other Christian ideas, as to run into pernicious error. It was so in the age of the Reformation itself; making it necessary for Luther and the other reformers to defend their cause against a false spiritualism in different forms, which they held to be even worse than the false realism of the Roman Church. And the Protestant world has seen enough of it since, sometimes in more theoretical rationalistic, and then again in more practical fanatical forms. Any one intelligently observant of the course of things at this time, in our own country particularly, may easily see to what licentiousness of opinion, this spurious evangelicalism has come in different directions; how it has undermined, in large measure, the original Protestant sense of justification by faith altogether; and how necessary it has become now, therefore, to call in the aid of that other side of the Christian faith, which regards especially the life and resurrection of Christ, in order that justice may be done to the whole sense of the Gospel, and Protestantism be held in true historical connection with the life of the Primitive Church; without which Dr. Dorner is himself willing to allow, it can have neither right nor power to exist as a Christian Church at all.

To express my whole view on this subject, I cannot do better, it seems to me, than to quote at large an admirable passage which I find bearing upon it, in Dr. *Martensen's* Preface to the German edition of his *Christian Dogmatics*, published in 1856.

"It has been objected to this system of theology from different sides," he writes, "even by theologians of my native country, that it contains elements which cannot be joined with the practical nature of Protestantism. Sin and redemption, it is said, and the plan of salvation connected with them, are the cardinal points that determine all in the Evangelical Church, and a system in which so many objective and speculative elements are taken up, and which gives such wide room, for example, to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Logos, has not maintained the Protestant stand-point. This objection, we see at once,

if it has any force at all, reaches not simply to my work, but to the speculative tendency at large in our Evangelical theology.

"But to judge of the relation of a system of theology to Protestantism, it is not enough to take the Protestant scheme of doctrine as once for all finished and complete; rather we must place ourselves at the point where the doctrinal productivity of Protestantism took its start, and consider the principle by which this productivity was ruled. The Reformation did not aim to form a new separate Church, but sought to purify the holy, universal church from the errors which, in the course of centuries, had come to obscure its true form. It intended no purely subjective Christianity, but the œcumenical, original Catholic Christianity, in renovated form; for which reason it went back not only to the Apostolical tradition in the Sacred Scriptures, but to the first Christian centuries generally, whose ecclesiastical testimonies show traces of the original purity and freshness of the new life. Was this return now to original Christianity completely carried out in the sixteenth century? Did the Protestant scheme of doctrine attain to full catholicity, so that all parts of the Christian faith were revived and renewed in *like proportion?* It was natural that the consciousness of redemption should come first to its representation; not only because this forms the heart of Christian religious experience, but because also the Reformation had to take stand immediately in opposition to the Roman Church, which had assumed more and more the character of a perverted Judaism, had more and more left the true way of salvation, and become a legalistic church. It was not strange thus, that the Protestant doctrinal system, on its first appearance, should take the Pauline type, especially as we have it in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians, and that it was made to centre in justification by faith, and its kindred topics, in the plan of salvation. Can we say, however, that the system attained by this to full catholiticy? It is plain as day rather, that although the Reformation denied no single article of Christian revealed truth, but on the contrary, sought to make all its own, essential parts of this revealed truth, nevertheless, were appropriated as a traditional heritage simply,

without coming to any true inward reproduction. The sense of revelation (*Offenbarungsbewusstsein*) did indeed make itself strongly felt, no less than the sense of redemption; there was controversy, for example, not only about the effects of the sacraments, but also about the nature of them, about the objective presence of Christ. But the sense of revelation was not developed by any means in the same measure with the sense of redemption. If we compare the Protestant theology here with the doctrinal consciousness of the first three centuries, we discover a great difference. We find, indeed, that the fathers of the first three centuries, like the teachers of the Reformation period, live and breathe in the element of redemption; but we do not find that they *reflect* with the same care on the experience of the redeemed; their reflection is not turning back always upon their justification by faith; they enter into no fine psychological analysis of the order of salvation, of the struggle of conviction and conversion, of sanctification and mystical union with God. On the contrary, we find another circle of doctrines determining the character of that period; we find in Irenæus, for example, the most important representative of the period, earnest and profound thought on the great truths of the Word made Flesh and the Holy Trinity, on the connection of the mystery of Creation with the Incarnation, on the presence of the Lord in the Sacrament, on the Resurrection of the Body and the Consummation of All Things. Those old teachers feel themselves drawn also especially to the writings of St. John; and this on account of their anti-Gnostic testimony to the coming of Christ in the flesh; while among the Epistles of St. Paul, they are most of all attracted by those to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, through their grand thoughts on the cosmical significance of Christ; Epistles, from which the period of the Reformation was not able at all to derive any similar benefit. Those old teachers, furthermore, take deep interest in the eschatological discourses of our Lord, in the apocalyptic sections of St. Paul's Epistles, and in the Revelation of St. John; which exercised a fructifying influence over their course of thought, altogether beyond any like experience on the part of the Protestant fathers. For who can deny that the doctrine of

the Last Things, is one of the weakest and most poorly handled topics belonging to the Protestant divinity?

"If now we are aware of this difference (and all deeper historical inquiry here has but served to place it in clearer light), we cannot, of course, think for a moment of giving up one iota of what has been gained by the Reformation, or of not going forward in the Pauline Augustinian direction. But just as surely as we know that the problem of the Reformation was of universal church character, and believe our Confession to be the most perfect one, because it is the most œcumenical expression of Christianity, so surely must this demand for church universality, for true catholicity, reveal itself also in theology. To express the object of theology then, in church-historical form, it is not enough, in my opinion, to say that it is to reproduce only the *redemption-consciousness* of the age of the Reformation, in a form answerable to the present need of the Church, as Schleiermacher, for example, apprehended the subject; but it is to reproduce, at the same time, in new form, the *revelation-consciousness* of the first centuries, whose contents the Reformation period took up mainly in a merely traditional way; or rather to *recapitulate both scientifically in a higher synthesis*, a synthesis which would then gather up into itself also all that was right in the theology of the Middle Ages. A theology, which in our time does not propose to itself this object, but aims at nothing more than to reproduce the Augustinian element of Protestantism, can have no promise of progress, and shows a want of power to comprehend the present need of the Church."

So Martensen; defending his theology here from the very same charge that is preferred against ours. The only wonder is, that such a man as Dorner should now seem to be countenancing at all the opposite view. For does he not also himself tell us, in plain terms, that the only order of theology, at this time, which has the promise of the future, is that which neither ignores Primitive Christianity nor ignores the Reformation, but is *truly historical* in the sense of doing justice to both; or in such way, that the original wholeness of the Christian faith shall be maintained, by such an apprehension of Protestantism

as may serve to place it in harmonious agreement at the same time with what was the life of the Church in the beginning? And what is this, I ask, but that very idea of the "recapitulation or gathering up of both in a higher synthesis," which Martensen insists upon as the proper object of all right theological science at the present time; and which, I will add, has been the animating soul of the entire church movement which is now at work among ourselves? All our theology aims at this; not a giving up of the Reformation, nor yet such a blind starting with it, as would infer that there had been no historical Christianity before that modern time; but a free inward conjunction of the Reformation life with the older life of the early Church. This, we know, means something more than the raking up simply of the dead bones and dust of either period; something more than a mere mechanical repristination of the buried past in any view; it can be reached only through a revivification of the true actuating spirit of both periods, which, as being in both the effluence and birth of the same One Spirit of Christ, must be capable, it is believed, of appearing in full concord with itself. Such a view implies, of course, that Protestantism has not from the first carried along with it the full and complete sense of all that was comprehended originally in Christianity. As Dorner himself says (see *Merc. Rev.* April, 1868, page 262, 263), there may be much left behind it yet in the old Communions, Greek and Latin, which it needs still to take up into itself as the necessary ultimate complement of its own higher life; and there is no question but that Martensen is right also, when he tells us that what is wanted particularly, is the bringing up of what he calls the old *Offenbarungsbewusstein* (sense of revelation—the powers of the world to come objectively considered) to some sort of parallelism with the *Erlösungsbewusstsein* (sense of redemption —the processes of the Christian salvation subjectively considered), which has come to be so generally all in all for Protestant thinking. Now this is precisely what is aimed at in our Liturgy. There is not in it anywhere the slightest undervaluation of Christ's sacrifice and death. On the contrary, the altar feeling pervades all its services, and gives them their universal tone

and force. But it seeks to carry along with all this, at the same time, the lively sense of the great Christian facts, *in the bosom of which only the ideas of atonement and justification can be kept from evaporating finally into sheer rationalistic dreams.* Hence its intonation of the Trinity, of the Word Incarnate, of the Life which has become the Light of men, of Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, of the Pentecostal Gift, of the Holy Catholic Church, and of the Second Advent; of all the grand ideas, in a word, that meet us in the Christological and Liturgical productions of the Ancient Greek Church. Hence its unison throughout with the sublime old Hymns and Creeds, that hold us in communion still with the Christian life of the first ages.

XI. THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

It is not necessary to go into any large consideration of what Dr. Dorner has to say on special topics comprised in our Liturgy. He makes no points other than those which have been already urged against it, to so little purpose, in this country; and adds nothing at all to the interest or weight of their discussion. In the nature of the case, moreover, the view he takes of them is conditioned altogether by his general view of the Church. Here, as we have seen, he diverges from the Christological scheme of the Apostles' Creed. If he is right in doing so in the way he does, then without farther argument he may be considered right also in the other points now referred to; but if, on the contrary, the Creed is right, and his divergency from it wrong, it becomes no less certain of itself again, and without farther argument, that on these other points also he is wrong.

As regards our *Form of Baptism*, he acknowledges that "its doctrine agrees essentially with the Heidelberg Catechism;" but it should have mentioned more distinctly, he thinks, the necessity of penitential faith, so as to avoid all semblance of magic; and he considers it a defect in the service for children especially, that while great emphasis is laid on original sin no corresponding reference is made to the forgiveness of sin as the turning point of salvation. But this is simply captious. One main part of the office is the use of the Apostles' Creed, which surely is positive enough on this point; and in the address to

parents the "remission of sin" is declared to be, no less than the "gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost," the special purpose of the whole transaction.

The *Form for the Holy Communion* again he pronounces in many respects beautiful; but looks upon it, at the same time, as objectionable on the score of some forms of expression, which in his view approximate, in sound at least, too near the old Oriental theology, to suit the modern evangelical ear. This is a mere personal opinion, easily enough intelligible from what we have seen to be Dr. Dorner's general theological position; on which it is not necessary here to bestow any particular attention. The Liturgy, by its own acknowledgment, aims at being something more than a mere mechanical echo of the cultus of the sixteenth century; it seeks to be historical, by reaching back through this to some felt unison with the liturgical spirit of the early Church; just as Dr. Dorner himself tells us Protestantism at large is required to be historical in the same way, by joining its whole existence with the Christian life of the first ages, and not pretending to start absolutely with the age of the Reformation. What if our office of the Holy Eucharist *does* breathe some portion of the same spirit that animated the worship of the Primitive Greek Church? Does that show it to be wrong? Or does that prove at all, that it may not be at the same time in substantial harmony with the religious life of the Reformation? No such sweeping judgment as this, certainly, can be maintained by any who believe seriously in the historical legitimacy of the Reformation, as being itself, in any true sense the birth and product of what Christianity was in all previous ages.

The qualified doubt expressed by Professor Dorner with regard to our forms of *Confirmation* and *Absolution* deserve no separate notice; because we see at once that he is ruled in the case altogether by that low view of the Christian Ministry which runs through all his writings, as it is in some sense necessary also to his German ecclesiastical position, and which seems to have been the main occasion of his dissatisfaction with the Liturgical movement in our American Reformed Church.

Here we meet in full force his antagonism to the old idea of the Church, as we have it made an article of faith in the Apostles' Creed; and understand also why it is, that he shows himself so uncompromisingly opposed to the *Church tendency* of late years, whether under Anglican or German form; refusing to see in it any promise of help whatever, for the deplorable necessities of Protestant Christianity at the present time. He has before his fancy the bright vision of a resuscitated Protestant theology, to be followed by a corresponding resurrection of the dead Protestant life of Germany; but all this is to be reached in his view, it would seem, without any practical account of the Holy Catholic Church.

The burden of his objection to our *Ordination Service* is, that it converts the solemnity into a *sacrament*. This he finds in the fact that the office of the Holy Ministry is represented in it as being of Divine origin and supernatural force, flowing forth directly from Christ as the fruit of His resurrection and glorification; as being designed by Him to carry forward the purposes of His grace upon the earth, in the salvation of men by the Church, to the end of time; as starting in the Apostles, and being transmitted from them, by true succession, down to our time; and as involving, therefore, an actual commission from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself to exercise all the functions and powers appertaining properly to so high an appointment. Over and over again, this representation is charged with involving sacramental, hierarchical and magical conceptions of the Ministry, incompatible with sound Protestantism. How far such a judgment now may suit the present condition of Protestantism in Berlin, or in Germany at large, I will not pretend to say; but I am very sure that a very considerable portion at least of the Protestant world is not yet prepared to accept it, either in Great Britain or in this country.

The way in which Dr. Dorner operates here and elsewhere with the mere words *Sacrament* and *Sacramental*, as if they were of uniform fixed sense, and that sense always what they are taken to mean in the case of the two Christian sacraments strictly so called, is hardly worthy of his high character and

great learning. He knows very well, of course, that the terms have been used from the earliest times in a far wider sense than this; and that it is only by conventional usage that they have come to that more restricted meaning which is now common. The Latin *sacramentum*, ecclesiastically understood, is simply the Greek *μυστήριον*; and it has its sense fundamentally in the idea of the invisible and supernatural made to be present through the outward forms of Christianity. This *mystery* finds its most concentrated expression in the forms of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which for this reason are rightly called *sacraments* in the most absolute sense of the term. But it would be a most barren view of Christianity, to suppose that these central institutions must exhaust the entire mystery of its supernatural presence in the Christian world, so that it must be regarded in every other relation to the world as an object of thought merely and nothing more.

Such is the connection in fact between nature and the supernatural, that where the power of seeing and feeling it has come to be properly awakened through the exercise of religious faith, the whole visible creation will be felt to be, not the outward symbol only, but in a profound sense the very sacramental presence of things unseen and eternal. "The moral and devotional writings of the Fathers," it is beautifully said by Keble, "show that they were deeply imbued with the evangelical sentiment, that Christians as such are living in a new heaven and a new earth; that to them 'old things are passed away,' and 'all things are become new;' that the very inanimate creation itself also is 'delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' Thus in a manner they seem to have realized, though in an infinitely higher sense, the system of Plato: every thing to them existed in two worlds: in the world of sense, according to its outward nature and relations; in the world intellectual, according to its spiritual associations. And thus did the whole scheme of material things, and especially those objects in it which are consecrated by scriptural allusion, assume in their eyes a sacramental or symbolical character."

No wonder then that these same Fathers carried the sense of the sacramental, in all directions, into their view of Christianity itself, in which the mysterious relation between nature and the supernatural came for them to its highest utterance and force. In Tertullian the term sacrament is used to denote the whole Christian Religion, and also its particular doctrines. The Trinity thus is a sacrament; the Incarnation is a sacarment; and finally all Christian rites and ceremonies are sacraments, so far as they serve to bring into view mystically the realities of the unseen world in which Christianity has at last its true and proper home. Cyprian also finds sacramental meanings everywhere, in the ordinances and appointments both of the Old Testament and of the New; and so the early Christian writers generally. "The Fathers," says Knapp, "called every thing standing in any relation to religion *sacramentum*, and extended the term especially to all religious rites which have a secret sense or anything symbolical, and which are the external and sensible signs of certain spiritual things not cognizable by the senses." In these applications, the word is not used even by them, indeed, in the same full sense in which it is applied to the great central sacraments of the Church; but it is not to be disguised that it is used with a certain measure at least of this sense. Even in this broad use, the term will be found to mean more than such words simply as, *figure*, *emblem* or *symbol*. "God omnipresent," it has been well said, "was so much in all their thoughts, that what to others would have been mere symbols, were to them designed expressions of His truth, providential intimations of His will. In this sense, the whole world, to them, was full of sacraments."

Now in this broad view, there is just as much room as ever for ascribing to Christianity a general sacramental character; and to do so at any special point does not necessarily imply by any means that a new sacrament is there affirmed of one and the same order with the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Church itself is a sacrament, a *μυστήριον*, not to be apprehended, for this very reason, except through an act of faith. How can it be less than this, as being the body of Christ,

the fullness of Him that filleth all in all? And where then the sense of this has come to prevail, something sacramental will be felt to go along with all the offices and ministries of the Church. They become for us more than ordinary human agencies; more than what they are for such as have no faith whatever in the Divine constitution of the Church; they have in them to our apprehension everywhere, a measure of the same supernatural quality that belongs to this constitution at large. We believe in this way, without superstition, in the sanctity even of consecrated places and things. They are sanctified, as the Apostle expresses it, by the word of God and prayer. They cease to be profane or common, and become holy, through the blessing of the Church.

In view of all this now, it amounts to nothing that Dr. Dorner chooses to charge our Liturgy with making *ordination* a sacrament; because he is simply playing in the case with the use of an ambiguous term. He might with just as much reason say, that the Liturgy makes *Marriage*, or the *Burial of the Dead*, or the *Consecration of a Church*, a sacrament. The Liturgy itself says nothing of the sort in its Form of Ordination. All that Dorner can mean then is, that such a view is taken in it of the Holy Ministry as necessarily implies the idea of a sacrament, in the act by which men are set apart to the office. All turns therefore at last, on what this view actually is and the construction which is thus put upon it by Dr. Dorner. Now when we look into the case, we find that all resolves itself simply into this, that the Ministry is represented to be a supernatural office, and that in the view of Dr. Dorner the conveyance of any such supernatural office to men through the solemnity of ordination must be held to be a sacrament in the fullest sense of the term. What he in fact disowns then, under this notion of a sacrament, is the idea of a truly supernatural character in the constitution of the Christian Church, and in the office of the Holy Ministry, in any form. And here we, of course, join issue with him in full. The real question between us is not, whether Ordination be a sacrament like Baptism or the Lord's Supper; the Liturgy says nothing of that sort; but

whether it be a real investiture from Christ with the powers of a true heavenly office, or nothing more than an ordinary designation on the part of men to an office which is not heavenly at all, but of like force only with common human ministries under other form.

Against this last view now, it must be maintained with all earnestness that the Christian Church is Divine as well as human, and that the Christian Ministry also is of "truly supernatural character and force." The two go necessarily together. A supernatural Church with merely natural functions and powers, is a contradiction in terms. In the nature of the case, every constitution, civil or religious, must impart its own force, whatever that may be, to the organs and agencies through which it works and fulfils its mission; just as in nature everywhere the powers of any organized life reach forth into the activities it puts forth by its organs, so that what the life is these activities are also, in their derivative operation and force. Thus the majesty of the State conveys its specific quality, its own constitutional virtue and power, over into all the subordinate ministries by which it makes itself felt in the world. Every magistracy belonging to it is by its political commission invested, sacramentally we may say, with a portion of the same majestical distinction that forms the constitution of the State itself. And now if the Church be a real polity deriving its existence from the glorification of Christ, and holding in its constitution from Him the powers of the world to come (as we profess to believe in the Creed), how can we say less than that its organs and functions also must partake of this same more than merely human character; and that its ministers therefore, commissioned and appointed by Christ, are by this commission itself armed with rights and powers, more than civil or political only, and answerable strictly to the supernatural character of the polity from which their office depends. As the Church is, so must be also its Ministry.

Dr. Dorner takes no notice of the *Scriptural* argument, on which the Liturgy bases its view of the Christian Ministry: but tries to set the view aside, by simply opposing it with his

own different conception of the Church. But there the Scriptural argument still stands in all its unbroken force. There especially stands untouched that wonderful passage Eph. iv. 8–16; which it is strange how any one can seriously consider, without seeing that it involves virtually, not only the whole idea of the Church, but the whole idea of the Christian Ministry also, in that very sense of our Form of Ordination which Dr. Dorner now opposes, and against which he tries to create prejudice, by pronouncing it sacramental, hierarchical, and contrary to the true genius of Protestantism. Both the Church and the Ministry (and the first in and through the last), it would seem to be plain, are in this passage exhibited to our faith as a special constitution, consequent on Christ's triumphant ascension above all heavens, and flowing forth from the same through the Holy Ghost; and this at once is enough to establish the heavenly origin and supernatural character both of the one and of the other.

Such a Ministry, in the nature of the case, must be Apostolical; just as the Church must be Apostolical also, as well as One and Catholic. In other words, if the constitution of the Church in the beginning involved, in the way now stated, its dependence on a Divinely commissioned Ministry, we are bound to believe in the continuance of this order afterwards, and so in the continuance of such a Ministry also, holding office by the same commission. This at once is the idea of Apostolic succession. It may be a question how it is maintained; but we cannot give it up, without parting at the same time from the whole idea of what the Church was in the beginning. Such a succession is not of course on the outside of the general Church life, but still it is something more than the force only of this life, creating ministerial organs, as occasion may require, for its own use. It is easy to say, that this is hierarchical, and against the universal priesthood of believers. But there is no meaning really in such random talk; especially where it goes directly in the teeth of New Testament precedent and example.

Take a respectable Presbyterian authority on this subject. "The power of governing the Church," says Dr. John Dick,

"belongs exclusively to certain office-bearers, who derive their authority from Jesus Christ, and are accountable to Him alone for the exercise of it. The constitution of the Church differs from that of a civil society. A voluntary society is formed by the free consent of the members. Here, the society is before the rulers; but with respect to the Church, the rulers were before the society; and no reasoning, therefore, from the one case is fairly applicable to the other. There was no Church, when our Lord gave the Apostles their commission; when He committed to Peter, and to them all, the keys of the kingdom of heaven; when He invested them with authority to preach the Gospel, to administer the ordinances, and to exercise discipline over His professed disciples. They were appointed immediately by Him; and they were appointed as the first in a long succession, which was to continue to the end of time, as we learn from His promise to them: 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' The office of the Apostles was extraordinary, and ceased at their death; but, besides the gifts of inspiration and of miracles, they were possessed of ordinary powers, for the edification and government of the Church, which did not expire with them, but passed into other hands. The pastors, and teachers, and rulers, who existed in the primitive times and can never be wanting, without the dissolution of the Church as an organized body, were appointed by the Apostles. They were set apart to their office, and through them as the channel in which power was conveyed to them from Christ, the source of all spiritual gifts and privileges. This is the channel of transmission which was established in the beginning."

This is sound Presbyterian doctrine; such as I had instilled nto me by Dr. Miller, of blessed memory, years ago, in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Take again, however, a still more striking testimony from the great English Independent of the seventeenth century, Dr. John Owen; who will not allow the popular principle of Congregationalism itself to bar out this idea of a Divinely ordained Apostolical Ministry, so essential is it in his mind to the constitution of the Christian Church. After having spoken of Christ's institution of offices in His

Church, and of the call and ordination of ministers, he goes on to say:

"By these ways and means doth the Lord Christ communicate office-power unto them that are called thereunto; whereon they become not the officers or ministers of men, no, not of the church, as unto the actings and exercise of their authority, but only as the good and edification of the church is the end of it; but the officers and ministers of Christ Himself. It is hence evident, that in the communication of church power in office unto any persons called thereunto, the work and duty of the church consists formally in acts of obedience unto the commands of Christ. Hence it doth not give unto such officers a power or authority, which was formally or actually in the body of the community by virtue of any grant or law of Christ, so as they should receive and act the power of the church by virtue of a delegation from them; but only they design, choose, and set apart the individual persons, who are thereon entrusted with office power by Christ Himself, according as was before declared." Again: "This choice or election doth not communicate a power from them that choose unto them that are chosen, as though such a power as that whereunto they are called should be formally inherent in the choosers, antecedent to such a choice. For this would make those that are chosen to be *their* ministers only, and to act all things in their name, and by virtue of authority derived from them."

In other words, according to Dr. Owen, the forms of Congregationalism must not be allowed to prejudice the idea of a *jure divino* Ministry, and of a real transmission of office in the case, from its first Apostolical appointment and ordination onward to the end of time, through a channel different from the general life of the Church. Just as sacramental certainly, and just as hierarchical, as the tying of the Holy Ghost to any Episcopal or Presbyterian law of succession.

And now, as I am in the way of quotations, let me urge another (strongly to the point) from high authority, in our own American Reformed Church. On the subject of the Christian Ministry, my old respected Mercersburg friend and colleague

Dr. Schaff, in his History of the Apostolical Church, writes in different observations as follows:

"Church government has its foundation in the Christian Ministry, which is originally identical with the Apostolate and contains the germs of all other church offices. It was instituted not by men, but by Christ Himself in person. When our Lord was about to leave the earth, He gave His disciples, whom He had gathered around Him since His public appearance as the Messiah, and trained by a three years personal intercourse, a commission to continue His divine work; to preach the Gospel to every creature; and to baptize the penitent in the triune name of the Creator, the Redeemer and the Sanctifier of mankind. The Apostles here appear as representatives of the ministerial office in general. The design of the Christian Ministry is none other than that of the mission of Christ Himself—the redemption of the world from sin and error, and the extension and completion of the kingdom of God, as a kingdom of truth, love, holiness, and peace. The ministry is the vehicle of the powers of divine grace; the appointed channel for conveying the blessings of the gospel to mankind; the organ through which the Holy Ghost acts upon the world and gradually transforms it into the kingdom of God. The ministerial office was originally one and the same with the apostolical. But as the Church outwardly and inwardly grew, the Apostles found their sphere of labor so enlarged, that they could no longer attend to all the duties of discipline and public worship, and were compelled to resort to a division of labor. In this way arose gradually, as the wants of the Church and the force of circumstances required, the several offices, which *have their common root in the apostolate, and through it partake in various degrees of its divine origin, its powers, its privileges, and its duties.* All the various branches of the spiritual office are the organs, through which Christ Himself in the Holy Ghost continues to exercise on earth His offices of prophet, priest and king."

Here we have all that is claimed in my present argument. The Ministry is of direct ordination from the great Head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ; not in the way of new ap-

pointment from age to age; but in virtue of the commission, by which the Apostles were originally set apart to their work of founding and organizing the Church; a commission, the force of which was to endure through all time; and the very conception of which therefore, as thus one and continuous, involves necessarily the idea of Apostolical succession. The ministerial office in this way is no outgrowth simply of the universal priesthood of believers; it holds immediately and directly from Christ Himself, and not from Him circuitously only through the Church. This is exactly the view which is taken of the office in our new Liturgy.

Dr. Dorner's notion of the Church and its ministry is altogether different. The Church, with him, comes before the Ministry, is independent of it, has the power of creating it, in fact, at its own pleasure! "The organic communion which proceeds from Christ through the Holy Ghost," he says, "cannot depend on the external rite of a sacramental ordination, so as to derive from this first its reality and historical character. It is rather the object of faith; we must distinguish between the Church as visible and invisible as outward and inward, and the common notes of both are only the Word, Holy Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist, which are sufficient to furnish reliable ground for such organization as is needed here on earth with free variation answerable to different times. The Word of God demands preaching and the administration of sacraments according to divine or doctrinal necessity. But how particularly the duty and right of the Church to exercise this perpetual function should be ordered has not been divinely prescribed, but is left to that wisdom by which the Church is bound to make the best possible provision for the wants of every time. It is therefore arbitrary, when Nevin heaps upon the ministry all church powers, and thereby robs the laity of their proper rights, in a way that puts the common minister higher than the Catholic Church puts her bishops. Such a practical undervaluation of the universal priesthood of believers could not be possible, if Dr. Nevin had not unconsciously forced the stage of the Reformation, with its more inward apprehension of

the Gospel of free justification, back to the stage before the Reformation."

If this now means anything, it means that the Church has its full constitution in the possession simply of the Word and Sacraments, and that the ministration of these is placed entirely in her own hands to be provided for in different periods, by agencies of her own appointment, as to herself may seem best. The Ministry thus is made to be the creature entirely of the popular will in Christian form, supposed to devolve its own powers on those whom it sets apart for its service in such sacred office. Such plainly is the sense of Professor Dorner's theory. What he says of my heaping *all* powers on the office, and so making no account of the universal priesthood of believers, sounds to me, I must confess, little better than Bombergerian clap-trap, and carries with it to my mind no force whatever.

How far this German theory, now, may be settled authority for the Evangelical Protestantism of Germany we need not at present stop to inquire; one thing is certain, as I have intimated before, it is not what has generally been regarded as sound doctrine among the historical Protestant Churches of England, Scotland, and this country; and when Dr. Dorner makes it the test of fidelity to the Reformation stand-point, he cannot be considered to say the least, as representing truly the best faith of the Protestant world.

What then are we to think of those among ourselves, who in their zeal against our Liturgy have shown themselves willing to fall in with Dorner's exceedingly low view of Ordination and the Christian Ministry? The Liturgy has served as a *lapis lydius*, to bring out the secret quality of some very bad divinity among us at other points. How is it here? Let those see to it, whom it may concern.

XII. THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTESTANTISM.

The different points of controversy which have thus far claimed our attention, as may be easily seen, refer themselves throughout, more or less directly, to one great radical subject of inquiry, *the principle of Protestantism, and its right relation to the prin-*

ciple of Christianity. Here the controversy between Dr. Dorner and myself, the divergency, as he calls it, of our Christological ways, comes to what is, after all, its main meaning. The subject is large and difficult. I can only, of course, glance at it briefly in this closing article of our present discussion.

We have seen how, in various ways, Dr. Dorner takes occasion to insinuate, or openly assert, that my Christological views, and the reigning spirit of our Liturgy also, are not in harmony with the essential genius of the Evangelical Church (meaning by this, Protestantism in its German form), but involve, if not a conscious, at least an unconscious falling back upon a standpoint anterior to the Reformation—not just Roman Catholic perhaps—but then all the more certainly Oriental or Greek, as we find it in the first Christian ages. Let us now try to understand exactly what this German Evangelical theory of the Reformation is, in its modern form, which is thus made to be the measure of all true and sound Protestantism, in such sweeping style.

Dorner, as we have seen, sets out in his criticism, by charging me, in a polite way, with overlooking the fact that for Protestantism, all turns on faith and the right relation of the soul to God; as if my idea of a Christocentric theology implied somehow, that the mere theoretical knowledge of Christ is to be considered the source of true Christianity for us (either as theology or as practical religion), apart from all personal experience of what Christ is for us as the power of salvation. No misapprehension could well be more total or complete. The central place assigned to Christ in my theology has always been under the view of an actual apprehension of His person, first of all, through the exercise of faith; and it is only wonderful, how Dr. Dorner could ever have got himself into any other imagination. Certainly all true Christianity has its ground for us in faith, the power of saying with Peter, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.* But no such faith can exist without embracing its object; and in such view the object apprehended is still more the ground of what is thus brought to pass (although object and subject in the case go both together), than is the simple act of

apprehension, by which it is taken up into our subjective life. Dr. Dorner knows that, and admits it freely; although at times he seems to forget it, and talks as if the mere subjective exercise of faith (without regard to its contents) were to be considered in some way of independent authority in the Protestant system. This we know is the view that has come to be taken practically of the Protestant principle, by a very considerable part of our modern sectarian religion. Faith itself, or mere personal feeling and conviction, is made to be with it the source of justification; and the freedom of the Reformation is taken to be the right of determining, from within simply, what is true Christianity, without regard to any objective authority whatever. But such is not Dr. Dorner's view. Faith, with him, is of no account, and can have no real existence in fact, without being filled with the positive substance of Divine truth. Here too he sees (though sometimes a little confusedly), that this truth is not just the documentary form in which it is presented to us in the Bible, but the living fact of revelation itself, as it lies behind the Bible and looks forth upon us through its inspired pages. Faith has to do in the case, not primarily with the inspiration of the book, but with the substantive matter which the book makes known; with this, in its own immediate self-authenticating form. But now, all revelation centres in Christ; and so Dorner is willing to admit, in the end, that the last ground of certitude for faith, is found in the direct apprehension of the Saviour Himself, who is the alpha and omega of all that God has been pleased to make known of Himself in this way. This, as I have remarked before, seems to be equivalent to making the Person of Christ the root and principle in full of the whole Christian salvation. But here it is now, that Dr. Dorner refuses after all, so far as I can understand him, to carry out this great thought to what seems to me to be its necessary theological consequences, as we have them set forth comprehensively in the Apostles' Creed. On to this point, our ways would appear to be in general harmony; since it is a pure mistake, to suppose that I make any less account than he does of the factor of faith in the Protestant principle. How is it then, that just here the material

principle of Protestantism becomes with him, all at once, something different from what it is in my system; to such an extent that I am charged with being unfaithful to it altogether? The subject is of fundamental account for this whole discussion, and deserves certainly our most close attention.

The peculiarity of Dorner's view of justifying faith (the material principle of Protestantism) shows itself in this, that the feeling of a rectified relation to God (the sense of guilt met with the sense of pardon through the righteousness of Christ) is regarded by him as going before the apprehension of Christ in any wider view, and as mediating, so to speak, our full access to His person. His interest is in maintaining the absolute autonomy of the believing subject; which he thinks cannot be done effectually, without making the subjective side of the process of salvation in this way the *primum mobile* of the whole movement. Faith must be free of all outward authority, all coercion from beyond itself. It is independent thus of the Church, of course; but that is not all; it is independent also of the Bible; and in the end, it would really seem, is to be considered independent also of the objective presence of Christ Himself, except as a certain inward experience comes in first to make Him intelligible and apprehensible in His whole character to the awakened soul.

I am blamed for making the objective Christ primordial for the Christian salvation. This position, he will have it, belongs in the Evangelical Church only to faith; which is (*per se*, it would seem) the "Divine assurance of salvation;" and in which, as the consciousness of redemption, "is implanted principially, and as with one stroke, the consciousness of the Redeemer, and of His dignity and truth." That is: While the sense of subjective redemption and the apprehension of Christ's objective presence go in fact together, it is the sense of redemption nevertheless which, properly speaking, makes room for such embracing of the actual Christ, and which is thus the true principle of all that is reached in the process.

Thus, criticizing the Rev. S. Miller on what he says of the power of Christianity to make itself evident to faith, Professor

Dorner remarks: "Faith so described is unfortunately, however, not faith in personal salvation by Christ, but only in objective Christianity; its certainty, thus, does not rest on the experienced certainty of salvation, but on the blindly received authority of the Church, and is promised only as the reward of such blind, willful obedience. The author comes to this, by looking away from the ethical side of the faith process, from the eye of the moral consciousness which recognizes both its own sin and the righteousness of Christ."

This is clear. Faith, as the experience of subjective right-setting in relation to God, must go before all other evidence in Christianity. Except as mediated and illuminated by this, all other evidence, as being "only objective Christianity," must be necessarily *heteronomic*, a foreign outward law, for the proper freedom of the human spirit; and the faith engendered by it no better than blind, willful obedience to external authority (*Autoritätsglaube*, called also sometimes *Köhlerglaube*). The "objective Christianity" which Dr. Dorner has first in his mind, as thus heteronomic for faith, is that of the Church; though he does not shrink, as we have seen, from speaking of the authority of the Bible also in the same way. But what shall we say, when we find his language here virtually bringing the glorious Person of the Redeemer Himself under the terrible operation of the same Procrustean rule? "*Only* in objective Christianity," he says of all faith, for which its object has not *first* found the seal of its truth in the believer's own mind! But is such objective Christianity found only in the Church or in the Bible? Where have we it in full, if not in our Lord Jesus Christ himself? And shall we say now, that bowing implicitly to the authority of *His* presence, is blind, willful obedience to a heteronomic rule? Can we ever, by our subjective experiences, verify Christ sooner or farther, than He, through the blessed vision of His own Person, offered to the eyes of our faith, verifies *us* by the light of truth, showing us at once what we are, where we are, and whither we must turn for salvation? Subject and object in all such faith of course flow together; but it is a strange way of looking at the matter surely, to sub-

ordinate the objective to the action of the subjective; to make the last primordial for the process, and the first secondary only and relatively dependent.

So far, however, does this inversion prevail with Dr. Dorner, that he insists on conditioning by it the universal sense of the Gospel; in such sort that the Gospel must be considered as having been only imperfectly developed before the Reformation, because the principle of justifying faith, in the form here described, had not before been advanced to its proper autonomic dignity and independence. The great significance of Protestantism, he thinks, lies in the bringing out of this principle. Here is the signature of its being the work of God. This constitutes it a new creation; not in the sense of a full rupture with older Christianity (for Dorner, as we have seen, is historical, and requires a continuity of Christian life between the sixteenth century and the first ages); but in the sense of such a re-ordering of Christianity, as makes its whole previous history from the beginning to have been relatively defective and wrong, as not flowing strictly from the true idea of the Gospel. The standpoint of the Primitive Church, therefore, needs rectification from the retro-active force of the new position which was gained for faith in the age of Luther and Calvin. In other words, the principle of Protestantism here is made to be the only true principle of Christianity in its widest view; and we are given to understand, that we have no right (evangelically) to go back of it, in quest of any other more general root or ground in which it may be supposed to be comprehended.

Our theology, Dorner tells us, must be genuinely historical, by breaking neither with the Ancient Church nor with the Reformation. But this requires, he adds, that as "children of the Reformation" we proceed from its special standpoint, the free personal laying hold of Christian salvation and truth; an end, he goes on to say significantly, *which, in the manner of all teleology, must work back into what goes before it, so as to preclude whatever is not consonant with its own nature.* That is, it would seem, the true teleology of the Gospel is reached in the standpoint of the Reformation; and, therefore, the sense of

all earlier Christianity must suffer itself to be righted retroactively from this, instead of being called in ever as itself a principle of rectification for the later period. The beginning, thus, must be construed into conformity with the end, and not the end into harmony with the beginning. Such is Dorner's idea here of historical Christianity.

Now, it is true that the end, in God's ways, actuates and rules the beginning. But, as I have taken occasion to say before, it is only the absolute end that does this, and not any merely partial intermediate end. It is an utter wrong done to the full sense of Christianity, therefore, when Dr. Dorner presumes to circumscribe it by the special article of justification by faith, as we have this brought out in the sixteenth century. The full Gospel embraces far more than that in its ultimate teleology; and we are bound, accordingly, to include far more than that in its original principle or germ. For the very reason that the end must give us the sense of the beginning, I insist on seeing in the beginning *more* than the special mind simply of the sixteenth century, which cannot, by any means, be taken for the consummation of all Christian truth. Original Christianity is a deeper and wider fact than Protestantism; and in the relation of one to the other, the only true order unquestionably is that by which Protestantism is taken to have its root in Christianity, and not Christianity to have its root in Protestantism. The Protestant principle of justification by faith then is valid, only as it falls back on the general principle of Christianity, which is none other than Christ himself; and this in such a way, that Christ is not brought in as the instrument simply of our justification, but is apprehended as being at once in Himself the whole fullness of our salvation.

Here it is that Dr. Dorner's doctrine of Protestantism appears to me to be sadly at fault. It is not fully Christological in the sense of making Christ the absolute ground and beginning of Christianity. He acknowledges a falling away of Protestantism itself from its own original principle; which calls now for a reconstruction and righting of its whole present status (both as Lutheran and Reformed), by a proper historical recur-

rence again to this principle in its true sense. But he is not willing to see that the Protestant principle itself may need to be righted, or at least secured in its only right sense by a similar historical recurrence to the older and more general principle of Christianity as it comes before us in the first ages of the Church. For want of this his idea of historical Protestantism is lame, and his theory of what he calls the Evangelical Church very much of one sort in the end, I must be allowed sorrowfully to say, with the radicalism of our most unhistorical and unchurchly American sects. We see at once why he is not on good terms with Primitive Christianity; why he is not satisfied with the Christological construction of the Creed; why, in a word, he cannot abide its article of the *Church*, or the idea of an objective authority for faith belonging to the Church in any form.

To this it comes necessarily at last with the primacy of faith, as it is made to be the distinguishing basis of Protestantism by Dorner and other great German theologians. The old dualism between subject and object in religion, it is assumed, has been for theological science, since the time of Schleiermacher, effectually surmounted; by seeing in the supernatural only the necessary complement or filling out of the natural (as man's intelligence and will), which then the natural again, that is, the rational nature of man, has the power of taking into itself through its own free activity and apprehension. In this way the law is supposed to be maintained, that nothing can enter the mind as objectively binding for its intelligence or will, which is not first authenticated for it as true and right by its independent, spontaneous (not approval simply, but) actual production, as it were, from the depths of its own nature. This is that *autonomy* of faith, which is here put forward now as the true principle of the Reformation (over against all merely outward objectivity, whether of Church or Bible, Dorner makes no difference*); which our original Protestanism, it seems, did not it-

*"Did Paul," he asks "require submission, first, to an outward authority, faith in the Old Testament Scriptures, or in the Church, or in his own divine commission; or did he proclaim Christ from an overflowing heart, etc." To save Dorner's orthodoxy here his conscientious translator interposes after the "Old Testament Scrip-

self thoroughly understand, and so drifted away, by devious course into the Neology and general Rationalism finally of the eighteenth century; and which it is the business of the nineteenth century at last, we are told, to re-inaugurate in right form as our only reasonable hope for the welfare and prosperity of Protestantism in time to come.

Now I make no question, but that there is a deep truth in Schleiermacher's idea of a necessary correlation and synthesis of the natural and the supernatural in religion. But I have dreadful misgivings, I confess, with regard to much that I meet with among modern German theologians, in their way of carrying out the idea to its practical applications. There is no one of them whom I admire more than the late Dr. Richard Rothe, author of that wonderful structure of speculative thought which he has entitled *Theological Ethics*, himself a sort of Schleiermacher over again, and at the same time no less remarkable for what seems to be the simplicity of his piety than for the greatness of his learning and the profundity of his genius; and yet who can feel safe altogether in his guidance? With him, the synthesis of the human and the divine in Christianity amounts to a resolution of all at last, into a simple completion of the world process in its ultimate ethical form. The idea of the Church loses itself thus finally in the idea of the State! Dr. Dorner, with all his regard for Rothe, would join here, I suppose, in the condemnation of his system. But one cannot help feeling that his own way of looking at Christianity involves much also which would appear to run precisely in the same direction; as Rothe himself, indeed, charges the new *Evangelical* theology of Germany generally with not speaking out here fully its own necessary sense, and predicts that it must yet come openly to his ground. Is this whole scheme, after all, any other than the arch-heresy of our fallen life, *Humanitarianism*, in its most subtle and refined form, all the more dangerously adapted to deceive the very elect through such gorgeous semblance to

---

tures" a bracketed parenthesis thus: ["because handed down by the Church, B."]; but that is only his own fancy. Dorner himself means simply what he says; and knows also what he says, as his scholiast B. does not.

an angel of light? I merely ask the question, without pretending to answer it now; for the purpose of bringing into view the very deep solemnity of the subject with which it is concerned.

It is as coming within the sweep of this general humanitarian tendency that Dorner's doctrine of justifying faith in particular, regarded as the subjective material side of the principle of Protestantism, becomes to my mind unsound and unsafe. In his zeal for the full moral freedom of the believer (the autonomy of the human subject), he will have it that all merely objective authority must be held in secondary relation to the exercise of this subjective factor or force. So in the Bible, and so in the Church, and so then, in spite of himself, it would seem necessarily to follow, in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ also. For is not *He*, as already said, the fullness of all objective Christianity, before it becomes otherwise objective, either in the Bible or in the Church? Hence the weakness of Dorner's Christological hypothesis; by which he allows himself to invert the true relation of Christ's work to His person, and so of course the true order of faith in regard to it—subordinating, in fact, the wholeness of the Mediator to one function simply of His Mediatorial Office. Hence his persistence in the strange opinion, that to lay emphasis on the Incarnation and to magnify the life of Christ, is necessarily to wrong the claims of the Atonement, and to make small account of the death of Christ. Hence his confessed divergency from the Christology of the Creed, and the religious thinking generally of the first Christian ages. Hence his opposition at large to the idea of the Church as it stands in the Creed, and was for this old thinking unquestionably the object of universal faith.

Now, against all this I maintain, that the authority of Christ's presence and person (objective Christianity exhibited to us in Christ,) is the ground of all subjective Christianity. Faith, in its last and deepest sense, is simply submission (free, but yet unseeing also, and implicit) to such objective authority. The Gospel to which it bows is primarily an external Gospel. So the Apostles believed in response to the word, *Follow Me*. So the Apostolic commission runs: "He that believeth and is

baptized," that is comes under the yoke of entire self-surrendry to Christ through baptism, "shall be saved." And so it must be through all ages. The Christianity which was originally in Christ, must be for the Christian world an objective authority till the end of time. It is so in the Bible; but it is so also in the Church, and without its actualization for faith under this last form, it can never make itself fully actual in the first form. In some way the general life of Christianity (which is the Church) must come between all individual faith and the letter of Scripture, to make the relation either Christian or Protestant in any true sense of these terms. The very idea of faith implies a relation of dependence and need toward an object, which is thus for it an outward authority, (not indeed heteronomic, but still,) absolutely binding for its whole action; just as all natural vision holds in the objective power of outward light, without which there can be no exercise of the visual faculty whatever.

There is much in regard to this part of the subject especially which still challenges consideration, and which I would be glad to bring into the present discussion; but I am admonished by the length to which the discussion has already run that it is time to bring it to a close. It will be seen that my object has been throughout to hold the argument to general and broad issues, rather than to let it lose itself with secondary points and more or less merely incidental details. More than a full third part of Dorner's article is devoted to the Rev. Samuel Miller's *Mercersburg and Modern Theology Compared;* but only in the way of desultory criticism for the most part, (a running fire of short notes mainly,) on particular points selected miscellaneously from the general course of the book. So much attention from so high a quarter is of course complimentary to the book itself, and its worthy author; but it is of very little account for the interests of theological science; and it would be a waste of time to go into any examination of the criticism in its particulars, with the view of determining how much or how little of force it may carry with it in each separate case. Let the controversy, as I have just said, be kept to what we

have seen to be the fundamental matter of difference between Dr. Dorner and the theology of our Liturgy. This is sufficiently broad and deep. It concerns not simply our Reformed faith, our relations to the Heidelberg Catechism, but our Protestantism in general. Dorner takes the principle of Protestantism in a sense which makes it independent of historical Christianity, and narrows the significance of Christ Himself too much to its own subjective measure. The special principle of Protestantism with him, in other words, is not held in due subordination to the general principle of Christianity. In his system there is no room for the Church as one of the mysteries of "our undoubted Catholic faith." He is thus, by his own confession, not in full harmony with the Creed.

All this should be enough for our American Reformed Church. We have already planted ourselves firmly on the basis of the old Christian faith, as we have it embodied in this primitive symbol, and we are not likely now to recede from that good foundation. Our late grand Festival of the Heidelberg Catechism reached its conclusion in the following solemnly appropriate action, taken by the Synod of Lancaster in 1864, (*Minutes, p.* 145):

"I. Our Tercentenary Jubilee has served a wholesome purpose in reviving for our ecclesiastical consciousness a proper sense of what is comprehended in our confessional title, *Reformed*, as related originally to Lutheranism in one direction, and to the Catholic Church of the olden times in another.

"II. It is an argument of sound and right historical feeling in this case that the beginnings of our church-life are referred, not simply to the epoch and crisis of the Reformation, but through that also to the original form of Christianity as it existed in the first ages.

"III. The true genius and spirit of our Church in this respect is shown by the place which is assigned to the Apostles' Creed in the Heidelberg Catechism; where it is plainly assumed that the Creed, in its proper historical sense, is to be considered of fundamental authority for the Reformed faith.

"IV. It is a matter for congratulation, that our growing

sympathy with the Apostles' Creed is attended with a growing power of appreciation among us also for that Christological way of looking at the doctrines of Christianity, which has come to characterize all the evangelical theology of Germany in our time, and by which only, it would seem, the objective and subjective (in other words, the churchly and experimental) sides of the Gospel can be brought into true harmony with each other."

That is where we stand. The Heidelberg Catechism, anchored and moored securely in the old Œcumenical Creeds! Our Christology fixes us there and nowhere else. If Germany, in the person of Professor Dorner (even though he should be commended to us by an angel from heaven itself), come preaching to us now what is after all another Gospel, born of the general confessional demoralization which seems to be sweeping all theology there into the maelstrom of *humanitarianism*—Germany, in this case, will preach to us in vain. Our existence as a Church is bound up in our simple fidelity to the APOSTLES' CREED.

ART. IV.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By Thomas H. Skinner, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, No. 770 Broadway. 1868.

A second edition of miscellanies, containing discussions on the following topics: Miracles the Proof of Christianity, Nature of the Atonement, Christ Pre-existent, Christ Preaching to the Spirits in Prison, Impotence of the Will, Theory of Preparation for Preaching, &c. It contains Presbyterian theology of the New School type.

The argument on Miracles is directed against that kind of naturalism, which denies anything specifically new in Christianity. If these, however, are in error, the author, we think, takes an extreme, and, therefore, untenable position in endeavoring to refute them. It is very much the same position taken by the Roman Catholic Church, which appeals just as strenuously to miracles now wrought for the truth of their Church. The very title, *Miracles the Proof of Christianity*, is sufficient to indicate his error. "Evidences of Christianity!" says

Coleridge, "I am weary of the word." "The truth revealed through Christ has its evidence in itself." This position of Coleridge the author seeks to refute. It contains, however, a good deal of truth. The highest proof of Christianity lies in what it is as a whole. To take, therefore, one of its manifestations, and say that this is *the* proof of it, is to make the part greater than the whole. The back-ground of the miracle is more than the miracle taken separately. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana, of Galilee, *and manifested* forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him." Christ, not the miracle, manifested forth His glory. The shining of the moon can never prove that there is a sun to one who refuses to believe this upon seeing the light of the sun itself. Miracles have their place, undoubtedly, but that place is not to make them *the proof* of Christianity. As well might one say, the system of truth which Christ taught is *the* proof that He is God and man. But in saying this we would imply, that we have somewhere out of Christ a standard of truth by which to judge His teaching. Christ Himself is the central Sun, and these are the different beams of light that stream forth from His person. No one of them is greater than Himself.

On the subject of the atonement the author presents the common satisfaction theory, which to us seems most unsatisfactory. It is the common Presbyterian theory, except that it differs from the Old School view, in that it makes the atonement universal in its adequacy. "The boundlessness of the overture" (made in preaching the Gospel to every creature) "has an adequate ground in the atonement, whose breadth and length are also without bound." This is denied by Dr. Hodge in his work on the atonement. It is somewhat surprising, that, in the criticism of Dr. Hodge's work, which appeared in the New School Review, this point was so tenderly and lightly touched upon. And some in our own Church, who profess zeal, almost to phrenzy, for the pure Reformed faith, commend the work of Dr. Hodge, limited atonement and all, as the true Reformed doctrine. The whole error comes from regarding humanity and Christianity not as universals, but atomistic accretions. The Scriptures clearly and fully condemn it.

Here is a specimen of the author's exegesis: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," &c. 1 Pet. iii. 18, et seq. This is the meaning in paraphrase: "In order to save mankind, to bring us to God, He underwent the greatest extremity of suffering, having been put to death in the flesh. Yet His unparalleled sufferings were no detriment to Him in respect of His great undertaking. So far from this, they were the foundation of His success: all henceforth was life in His body, the Church and the world also felt His vitalizing power. By what abundant manifestations of the Spirit, and what glorious triumphs hath he since then been carrying on His mighty work of

saving men from that infinite wrath which is so fast coming upon the world. And this reminds me how this same mighty Deliverer exerted Himself by the Spirit through the ministrations of Noah, when the deluge was at hand. He then preached, by His faithful prophet, to the disobedient persons of that generation, whose disembodied spirits, are now in the prison of hell," &c., &c. We think he will have to try again.

The work is handsomely published, and may be commended as giving a fair statement of New School Presbyterian theology on the topics treated.

HINTS ON THE FORMATION OF RELIGIOUS OPINIONS. By Ray Palmer, D.D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Albany. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. 1867.

A handsome volume of 265 pages, originally issued in this country and republished in London. The present edition is from the English plates. The work consists of a series of discourses addressed especially to young men and women of Christian education. The subjects considered are such as the following: Evils of a State of Skepticism, Nature of Reasoning and of Proof, Responsibility of Men for their Opinions, The Practical Value of Opinions, Belief in the Being of God, &c., &c. It is addressed, not to those in a state of positive unbelief, but to those who, having been religiously educated, are in danger of doubt and skepticism. The style is chaste, the spirit earnest, and altogether the book is one calculated to exert a wholesome influence wherever it is read.

3 1198 04015 1438
N/1198/04015/1438X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 1438
N/1198/04015/1438X